THE DISCIPLES DIVINITY HOUSE
OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

HERBERT LOCKWOOD WILLETT
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
CARLI: Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois

http://www.archive.org/details/christianunionqu07unse

"The greatest need of our generation is that of apostles of reconciliation."—JOHN R. MOTT.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Edited by PETER AINSLIE

THE whole church is in error. No one of us can throw stones at the other. We could not have been in this plight of a multitude of divisions if we had not lost the path in which Christ walks. When we find our common guilt, we will repent of our common sin and find power to do the will of Christ.

JULY, 1917

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY
2712 Pine Street, St. Louis, Mo. Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

BL1

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Peace in the Divided Church of Christ. It is issued in January, April, July and October.

Edited by PETER AINSLIE

Vol. VII. JULY, 1917 No. 1

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:
THE UNTRODDEN PATHS OF UNITY 7

WHY THE MOVEMENT FOR CHURCH UNITY LAGS. EDWIN HEYL DELK 16

CONGREGATIONALISTS AND DISCIPLES. HUBERT C. HERRING AND HENRY C. ARMSTRONG 25

THE PROGRESS OF FEDERATION AMONG THE CHURCHES. CHAS. S. MACFARLAND 31

THE BASIS, METHOD AND ASSURANCE OF CHRISTIAN UNION. I. J. SPENCER 55

THE HIGHER UNITY. WILLIAM PIERSON MERRILL 63

BOOK REVIEWS 75

THIS JOURNAL IS PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY and is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Prof. A. R. MacEwen, 5 Doune Terrace, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Frederick Courtney, office, 143 E. 37th St., New York. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMAN'S UNION, 1896, President, Sir Richard Stapley, 33 Bloomsbury Square, London. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson, Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North, Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principle W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford, Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

SWANWICK FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, 17 Palace Road, Crouch End, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity

Inc.

(Having its Inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell a Presbyterian Minister of Washington, Pa., 1809)

An Organization of Disciples of Christ

PURPOSE OF THE ASSOCIATION: To watch for every indication of Christian unity and to hasten the time, by intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith."

Ινα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, πάτήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύη ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

Ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu Pater in me, et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint, ut credat mundus, quia tu me misisti.

That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

CONDITION OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE ASSOCIATION: Sympathy with the work of Christian unity, expressed in prayer and coöperation, irrespective of church affiliation, and the payment of not less than $2.00 for annual membership fee, payment preferably in January. Those paying less are counted contributors, but not members.

COMMISSIONERS: Peter Ainslie, D.D., LL.D., President, Baltimore, Md.; Carey E. Morgan, M.A., Vice-President, Nashville, Tenn.; F. D. Kershner, M.A., LL.D., Secretary, St. Louis, Mo.; H. C. Armstrong, M.A., B.D., Baltimore, Md.; E. B. Bagby, M.A., B.D., Washington, D. C.; F. W. Burnham, LL.D., Cincinnati, Ohio; I. S. Chenoweth, M.A., Philadelphia, Pa.; Finis S. Idleman, D.D., New York, N. Y.; Z. T. Sweeney, LL.D., Columbus, Ind.; B. A. Abbott, B.A., St. Louis, Mo.; H. M. Bell, M.A., LL.D., Des Moines, Ia.; E. M. Bowman, Esq., Chicago, Ill.; C. M. Chilton, D.D., St. Joseph, Mo.; J. H. Garrison, M.A., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.; J. H. Goldner, B.A., Cleveland, Ohio; F. A. Henry, M.A., LL.B., Cleveland, Ohio; T. C. Howe, Ph.D., Indianapolis, Ind.; W. P. Lipscomb, Esq., Washington, D. C.; R. A. Long, Esq., Kansas City, Mo.; Eli H. Long, M.D., Buffalo, N. Y.; C. S. Medbury, D.D., Des Moines, Ia.; C. C. Morrison, B.A., Chicago, Ill.; A. B. Philputt, D.D., LL.D., Indianapolis, Ind.; E. L. Powell, LL.D., Louisville, Ky.; W. F. Richardson, M.A., LL.D., Los Angeles, Calif.; I. J. Spencer, M.A., LL.D., Lexington, Ky.

WORK OF THE ASSOCIATION: The Commission of the Association is simply the Executive Committee of twenty-five members, nine of whom are the Committee on Direction, dealing with such problems as may come before the Association for action between the annual meetings. It is proposed to use this Commission under four divisions: namely, Commission on Christian Unity, dealing with Christian unity in general; Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order; Commission on Federation; and Commission on International Friendship. To all these subjects the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity has spoken. The Association publishes The Christian Union Quarterly.

For further particulars, address

Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity

PETER AINSLIE, President

Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

EDWIN HEYL DELK
is a native of Virginia, having been born in Norfolk, 1859. He was educated at the Friends Central and High School, Philadelphia, and the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg. He received the degree of Doctor of Divinity from Pennsylvania College. He has held pastorates in New York and Hagerstown, Md. His present pastorate is at St. Matthew's Lutheran church, Philadelphia. He is a lecturer of Theology in Temple University, president of the Inter-Church Federation of Philadelphia and author of *Three Vital Problems, The Heart of Religion,* and various theological essays.

HUBERT C. HERRING AND H. C. ARMSTRONG
did the larger work of preparing the paper in this number dealing with the Congregationalists and Disciples, as a special committee appointed by the respective commissions. Dr. Herring graduated in 1887 from Princeton Theological Seminary and in the same year he was ordained to the Presbyterian ministry. After serving several pastorates in that communion he became pastor of the First Congregational Church, Omaha, in 1898. In 1907 he became secretary of the Congregational Home Missionary Society, and in 1913, general secretary of the National Council of the Congregational Churches, Boston. Mr. Armstrong graduated from Cotner University and later attended Yale, receiving the degree of Master of Arts in 1910 and Bachelor of Divinity in 1911. He is the pastor of the Harlem Avenue Christian Church, Baltimore, and is one of the commissioners of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity. He is the president of the Maryland Sunday School Association and is active in interdenominational work.

CHARLES S. MACFARLAND
received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from Yale in 1899. He served in Y. M. C. A. work and in several Congregational pastorates until 1911-12, when he became general secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. He lectures on scientific, philosophical and theological subjects, and is a member of various societies having to do with these departments of learning. He is the author of *Christian Ministry and the Social Order, Spiritual Culture and Social Service,* etc.

I. J. SPENCER
is approaching a quarter of a century ministry at the Central Christian Church, Lexington, Ky. He was educated at Bethany College, from which he received the degree of Doctor of Laws. He has served in pastorates in Baltimore, Virginia and other churches in Kentucky before entering upon his present pastorate. For some years he edited *The Missionary Weekly,* at Richmond, Va., and is a frequent writer on fundamental, vital and current religious questions. He is a curator of Transylvania College and every week one of his sermons is published in the Lexington press.

WILLIAM PIERSON MERRILL
is one of the outstanding peace leaders, being president of the American Council of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. He was educated at Rutgers College and Union Theological Seminary, receiving from the former in 1904 the degree of Doctor of Divinity. His present ministry is with the Brick Presbyterian church, New York, having formerly served in Philadelphia and Chicago. He is the author of *Faith Building, Faith and Sight* and *Footings for Faith.* In the new department of *The Quarterly*—Christian Unity Pulpit—he appears with the first sermon.

THE DIVINE PLAN OF UNION

No mortal need fancy that he shall have the honor of devising either the plan of uniting Christians into one holy band of zealous coöperation, or of converting Jews and Gentiles to the faith that Jesus is that seed in whom all the families of the earth are yet to be blessed. The plan is divine. It is ordained by God; and, better still, it is already revealed. Is any one impatient to hear it? Let him again read the intercessions of the Lord Messiah in the seventeenth chapter of John. Let him then examine the two following propositions, and say whether these do not express Heaven's own scheme of augmenting and conservating the body of Christ. Nothing is essential to the conversion of the world but the union and coöperation of Christians. Nothing is essential to the union of Christians but the Apostles' teaching or testimony. Or does he choose to express the plan of the Self-Existent in other words? Then he may change the order, and say—The testimony of the Apostles is the only and all-sufficient means of uniting all Christians. The union of Christians with the Apostles' testimony is all-sufficient and alone sufficient to the conversion of the world. Neither truth alone nor union alone is sufficient to subdue the unbelieving nations; but truth and union combined are omnipotent. They are omnipotent, for God is in them and with them, and has consecrated and blessed them for this very purpose.

—Alexander Campbell.

The Modern Churches!

Pull down the fences!!!

"I PRAY . . . THAT THEY MAY ALL BE ONE . . . THAT THE WORLD MAY BELIEVE THAT THOU DIDST SEND ME."

1460

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Vol. VII. JULY, 1917 No. 1

EDITORIAL

THE UNTRODDEN PATHS OF UNITY

Once the Atlantic ocean was without a path across its three thousand miles of waves; likewise the skies were once without paths to their fascinating heights. Everything to which men have attained has first been in the distance. By persistent and constant advance the goal has been reached. This has been the history of every scientific achievement. These are so many challenges to the Church for the universal awakening of a desire for growth "unto the unity of the faith." Because the Church has not been united since the first centuries, but has developed along in broken, fragmentary fashion, is no reason at all that it cannot attain unto unity in this age. Complex and delicate as the problem may be, the achievements in science are reminders of the possibilities of the Church, for waiving every other problem, the union of the divided House of God must hold priority.

Facing a subject so momentous it is important to inquire into the reasons for its desirability, the efforts that have been made to that end, and the method of approach in these days.

It is desirable because unity is a fundamental part of all good and all progress. Anything that separates men by such severe cleavages as religious denominationalism is injurious to the mutual sociability of the race and the mutual advantage of mankind. Because religion has been sectarianized into numerous and separate camps the world is losing hope of finding help there for strengthening the ties of common brotherhood and so under various forms of socialism and kindred moves it is seeking to organize on a non-religious basis. In many instances this is being done with hostility against the Church, which is one of the prices the Church is paying for her divisions.

As an economic measure the desirability for unity is becoming more evident as the days go by. Here in America there are numerous little towns where one church would be ample, but instead half a dozen churches are struggling at their task and many of them are failing. A story was told in *The Outlook* of a western town of 800 population with eight church buildings—Roman Catholic, Presbyterian, Baptist, three Lutheran, according to nationality, two Methodist, North and South—all ugly, unkept buildings, associated with jealousy, envy and indifference, while four saloons were open seven days in the week and every kind of sin running riot in the town. *The Independent* tells of another town of 1,347 people with eight denominations there, with seven church buildings and a church-going population of 142 persons. Altogether these little churches have received from their church boards $18,154, which comes so close to misappropriation of funds that one dares not discuss it. In a little town of 700 people near the Atlantic coast there are five church buildings and three are closed, the other two barely existing. These are common instances.

This policy is wasting energy and money in perpetuating some useless denominational peculiarities, while those men and that money could be used in a hundred centers for the great social uplift of the multitudes that are rapidly forgetting God in their battle with poverty and crime. As serious as are our divisions on the foreign field, here in America the condition is both serious and alarming. Our one hundred millions of people are divided by cleavages of race, with forty tongues spoken here and a dozen colors of skin. Here we have our creedal separation between Christians and Jews, between Roman Catholics and Protestants, and Protestantism presenting a most ragged front with its multiplicity of divisions. All this, with a population whose fluidity has been unparalleled in the history of civilized nations, not only moving from one section to another, but having an immigrant flow of nearly a million annually and an emigrant flow of nearly half a million in the same period, intensifies the complicated and difficult problems which face the Church.

The chief purpose of the Church is to witness to the world that Jesus is the Christ, the world's only Saviour. A divided testimony is certainly not as strong as one that is united. If there were merely two divisions that would be bad enough, but when these divisions have been multiplied into the hundreds, it makes impossible a satisfactory explanation to either Americans or to non-Christian nations, unless some one denomination arrogates to itself that it alone is the true Church and all others are false. There may be some temporary progress under this policy, but there will come a day of severe reckoning, for this position can be classified only under crass sectarianism. The prayer of Jesus was, "I pray that they may all be one; even as Thou, Father, art in me,

and I in Thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may believe that Thou didst send me."

Three thoughts in this prayer must arrest our attention: first, there is anything else but oneness in the followers of Christ in this day, for in many instances Christian denominations do not so much as coöperate in any way with other Christians; second, the union that Jesus prayed for was not simply fraternal relations, but nothing less than a oneness like that between God and himself; third, the explanation as to why after nineteen hundred years the world does not believe that God sent Christ, lies in part, if not entirely, in the fact of the divided Church, which has proven itself incompetent to conquer any one nation on the globe, and therefore it is incompetent to conquer the world.

The necessity of a united Church has been so evident that there has hardly been a period in which some prophet has not been calling for reconciliation in the divided House of God.

Christ declared that the pathway of His followers would not be easy and consequently many would go astray. The statement "then shall many stumble and shall deliver up one another and shall hate one another" was spoken of His disciples, for only the upright can stumble. Stumbling and hating one another have been fulfilled in the divisions of His Church, but to the shame of those who stumble and to our shame. But He said, "They shall become one flock." There are evidences of growth in this day as in no day of the history of the Church. It may be that the full growth will not be until the great period of tribulation "such as has not been since the beginning of the world," when all parts of the Church shall be melted together like pieces of cold iron cast into a hot furnace. But it must come some time,

and perhaps from the furnace it will have to come. One thing is sure and that is the union of the Church is in the programme of God. Aside from the fact that it was both the prayer of Jesus and His bold affirmation, unity is a biological necessity as clearly as the tree is the product of the seed, or the blossom is the product of the bud.

Paul protested against the threatened division of the church at Corinth, charging it to carnal-mindedness, as expressed in jealousy and strife. Writing to the church at Ephesus, he saw all the factions growing into brotherhood and the result was that wonderful epistle setting forth the attainment of the Church unto unity. In the great divisions of Protestants and Roman Catholics some of the noblest souls pleaded for reconciliation. There were Zwingli, Melanchthon, Calvin, Calixtus, Grotius, Dupin, Leibnitz, Bossuet, Baxter, Stillingfleet, Owen, Chillingworth, Milton, Coccejus, John Wesley and Jeremy Taylor, down to Locke and Campbell, and a hundred more—Roman Catholic, Protestant and nearly every branch of Protestantism. But no generation has had so many as now in all communions who have taken it so prayerfully to heart and seen its necessity for the salvation of the Church as well as for the salvation of the world. "A house divided against itself cannot stand."

Various propositions have been made. Calixtus proposed as the summary of the minimum which is necessary for salvation the Apostles' Creed. Dury proposed the abolition of party names and bitter controversies and the establishment of a national church. A dozen other propositions have been made down to these times, when the two most recent propositions have come from the Protestant Episcopal church and the Disciples of Christ. The former proposed the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilat-

eral, which is, first, the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; second, the Apostles' Creed as the baptismal symbol and the Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith; third, the two sacraments ordained by Christ—baptism and the Supper of the Lord; and fourth, the Historic Episcopate. The Disciples have not presented their proposition under distinctive heads, but on the broader call of a complete return to the beliefs and practises of the Church as it was in the New Testament times, in name, doctrine and practises. "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." The move we are now facing is that of the Protestant Episcopal church for a World Conference on Faith and Order, to which sixty communions have responded most cordially.

Armies do not discuss the terms of surrender until the armies themselves have stopped fighting. Our immediate task is to bring cessation of hostilities and that will be a long time. The important issue now is not so much discussing the terms of union as it is to find the methods of approach to that discussion. First, there must be a universal awakening for a desire, and, second, there must be an approach to the subject in such a prayerful and humble spirit that we shall be able to follow the spirit of Christ without question. To do this we must begin in prayer—not that the other man may see the light as we see it, but that both may be able to see the truth as it is. A divided Church is wrong, fundamentally wrong, and the fault is upon us all, more or less, so that we must be driven to examine our own hearts and look with brotherliness upon him for whom we pray. We have gotten a long distance when we are able to appreciate the other man's position—the circumstances

that have brought him to it and the difficulties that surround him in it, as well as the advantages that have led him to contend for it. This is very necessary for any progress at all and this will come out of prayer. God's methods are praying men rather than systems or propositions.

Once union appeared to be largely a theological problem, but students are now seeing it has clearly as much to do with psychology, for our differences in many instances are temperamental. Into this field we must go cautiously, seeking to adjust our differences by temperament rather than by theology. Perhaps more than theology or psychology is the necessity of the higher ethical standard. The scandal of our pride, conceit, love of self, jealousy and other works of the flesh are known around the world. These must be got rid of, as the drunkard gets rid of his drunkenness, the fornicator of his fornication and the idolater of his idolatry. These are the great sins that are barriers far above all the theological or psychological differences, so the emphasis of these times must be upon the fundamentals of the religion of Christ rather than upon secondary issues.

The task is grave. We must learn to be free, freeing ourselves from sectarian thinking and think in the sphere of the universal. Catholicity must lift us above likes and dislikes until we are able to look out upon the great and sadly divided Protestants, Roman Catholics and Greeks with a keen sense that in all these divisions there are earnest Christians, earnest as we are, desiring as truly as we do to know God and walk in His paths. The problem is not, How shall we bring all to join this church or that church or some other church? or, How shall all these come to our standard? That is so brazen and so sectarian that we do not hear much of it now except in

whispers, but the problem is how we shall unite these Christian forces for the conversion of the world. Others have their standards. We are losing time when we measure these human standards by human standards. "We offend against the spirit of Christianity if we are self-assertive, if we contend for a side, if we cannot think it possible that we are mistaken, if we label all our opinions as convictions, if we do not try to learn from one another. All these offenses insulate us from one another, break the circuit and so far disable the religion of Christ as an organ for discerning the will of God." "The treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden in Christ," is the motto of a modest school that gives its time to the teaching of the Scriptures. Christ is supreme. In our approach interpretations of yesterday must give way to new views that we have to-day, and these to newer views that we will have to-morrow. There must be such freedom in our approach, such catholicity in our spirit and such passion for God, that the barriers will be insignificant hindrances over which we will rise to the holy triumph. It is the unity of the faith—not the unity of theology. There must be a living faith, expressing itself in implicit trust in Jesus as the Christ. It cannot come by this policy or that, this scheme or that, this diplomatic move or that; it can only come as a great spiritual impulse rising in the hearts of the children of God around the world.

If there followed the war of 1870 such serious conditions as startled the European churches, what will be the results of this intercontinental war? The Church will survive it, to be sure, but what huge difficulties will face every advance! Our petty differences dwindle into insignificance by the side of the forces that are directing us to unify our strength for the conquest of the world. We

are not looking for a platform so much as we are for a road upon which we can advance together. The reconstruction of the nations cannot be accomplished amid the petty jealousies of sectarian forces. When the whole Church has found the value of prayer and humility and love, we will somewhere find the great roadbed that will lead us to the Himalayan heights of the Church. From the misty mountain tops we shall look out with renewed hope and move in constant expectancy to that sacred task committed to us by our Lord Jesus Christ, whose we are and whom we serve.

WHY THE MOVEMENT FOR CHURCH UNITY LAGS

By Edwin Heyl Delk, D.D., Pastor St. Matthew's Lutheran Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

The greatest problem which our modern Christian communions have to face and solve is the unity of the Church. There is existent a deep underlying Christian unity among all believers in Jesus Christ as divine Lord, but this spiritual unity must have visible and practical expression in order to fulfill the prayer of Christ and meet the needs of the modern world. Community and world-wide evangelism, missions, the Christian reconstruction of society, and a true international life is waiting upon the coöperation and unification of the various churches calling themselves Christian.

Various forms of overture have been made by differing religious organizations. The Lambeth Quadrilateral, the Conference on Faith and Order, and other pronunciamentos have been offered the dissevered Church, but so far, little has resulted in the way of Church unity. A splendid and effective organization—the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America—has been organized and incorporated and is doing important work in the unification of the Christian forces of our land. But avowedly it is but a council, and does not aim at Church unity. True there is a small and growing group within the Council that believes that it should aim at a higher goal—the unity of the Church. Certain it is that its research work and fellowship have made clear the desirability of a federation of the Christian churches in the United States.

But as regards our distinct problem of Church unity

the movement drags and many have grown hopeless of reunion, or turn away from the hope and are seeking to find comfort in an intensified denominationalism. Neither of these reactionary attitudes is Christian, or statesmanlike.

It behooves us all to frankly face, and answer to the best of our ability, the question "Why the Movement for Church Unity Lags."

Though it may seem a puerile form with which to hold the attention of thinking men, I venture to present my personal analysis of the limping pace in five alliterations of the letter P; i.e., Precedent, Preoccupation, Prejudgment, Pride, Possession.

Precedent: We are all the disciples of class tradition. We are all the subservient members of a group consciousness. We accept what has been, as the justification of what is. Now there is truth in the position of the traditionalist. His truth is not necessarily a theological but a social truth; i.e., the value of a certain religious atmosphere for our own personal religious life and career. A man's religious life usually flourishes best in the church of his forbears. But a certain inertia of thought and action is also a concomitant of precedent and tradition. The average churchman takes his theological and ecclesiastical shibboleths from his bishop, theological professor and board secretary. He is not prepared to investigate, or judge, for himself of the relative merits of his separate communion, or the relation of his part of the Church to the whole Church. Three or four hundred years of denominational history seems to him a long and venerable life for a church. What went on before, or besides, his own historic group may interest the Church historian, but for him—"the practical

layman''—he rests content in the way of his fathers and moves on in the narrow groove of denominational tradition. He is pointed out as a ''loyal'' Episcopalian or Lutheran, Baptist or Methodist, Disciple or Congregationalist. To investigate or revalue one's own denominational history, theology and life in the light of other theologies and cults, looks like making an ignominious surrender to ''modern thought'' or ''unionistic disintegration.'' So men wrap the drapery of a somnolent particularism about them and lie down to pleasant dreams of world conquest. Precedent in industry, government, social life and church often stands as a barrier to a broad, progressive view of truth and the betterment of life generally. Precedent must justify itself in the light of reason and experience in order to be respectable. ''The church of my fathers is good enough for me'' sounds quite loyal and sufficient, but in nine cases out of ten it reveals intellectual stagnation and a disinclination to move out into the larger Christian thinking and fellowships.

Preoccupation is the second obstacle in the pathway of realizing the unity of the Church. The average bishop and minister is so absorbed in his diocese and parish work that the call to consider such a problem as the unification of Christendom seems a thing apart from real life. I sympathize with the modern parson who is overburdened with parish duties and serves on boards of all sorts. One can't be thinking of endless parish problems and the individual needs of one's flock and find time for the weightier matters of modern literature, missionary enterprise and conferences on faith and order. Yet when one stops to consider that there is no problem more important than the question of the co-

ördinating of what Christian forces there are for the redemption of individual men, society, and a war-stricken world, absorption in parish work is petty ecclesiasticism. This movement for the visible and actual unification of the Church is so vital to the dignity and impress of our faith upon the world that to hand its solution over to a few leaders of the Church robs the movement of that broad, simple, democratic quality which is the very hope and heart of the movement. Preoccupation has spelled disaster in many a man's career. No personal preferences in study, no personal absorption in hobbies, no devotion to a club or guild, no consuming zeal even in denominational missionary enterprise releases the modern minister from participation in the solution of this great problem of the reunion of Christendom.

Prejudgment comes as near being a moral sin as it does an intellectual barrier to the movement for Church unity. This is the chief intellectual obstacle to reunion. Not one man in ten is willing to open the whole case and consider the origin and history of dogma, forms of church organization and the pedigree of cults. These fundamental notes of Church life are considered settled in his particular way, and any movement for the coördination or unification of other faiths with his own savors of heterodoxy and surrender of the faith once delivered to the saints. In the light of recent studies of the early Church with its variety of dogma, its various types of organization and its varying rites, no judgment based on the studies of twenty-five years ago is sufficient basis for a true estimate of the Church life. Without a knowledge of what Harnack, Sohm, McGiffert, Grutzmacher and others have written upon the first century

Christianity and the Church, one's opinion on theology, polity and cultus is practically obsolete, and certainly futile. Even in the study of our denominational differences we have learned in these later days of the influence of political and social factors which gave color to the confessions, the administration, and the life of the various churches. Historical criticism has made impossible the narrow and exclusive claims made by the various denominations. We have learned that it is the Spirit that giveth life, the letter killeth. No longer can exclusive claims be made for any one form of Church organization, or some single rite be made the basis for the erection of a Christian denomination. The partial and divisive views are surely to be merged into a catholic faith and life. It is foolish to prejudge just what the reunited Church will be. It cannot be less than the whole Christian thought and the whole Christian experience.

Pride: Sectarian satisfaction so easily passes over into exclusiveness of feeling that such loyalty becomes pride, and pride blinds our eyes to the value of other communions. There is first the pride of intellect. It is well for a man to trust his own judgment, but his judgment must be brought into court where in the minds of a wide scholarship his own personal judgment is submitted for estimate. There is nothing which so mars the clear vision and the warm fellowship of life as pride. It is often based on a false and always on a narrow point of view. The claim to be "the Church" and the "only Church" by any Christian group is obsolete among all informed men to-day. Surely this spirit has blinded our eyes to the worth in other Christian communions. It has made us hard and indifferent to the

faith and beauties of character of other folds, which possessions, after all, are the true and final test of Christianity. Only as we humbly approach the intellectual and moral tasks presented by Church, theology, and the Christian life can we hope to overcome those natural differences of taste and predilection which all of us entertain. Where there is pride there must be division and strife and separations. Humility and love are essential notes in the realization of the Christian ideal of the Church.

Possession: Possession we are told is nine-tenths of the law. The holding of power and position naturally puts individuals and classes on the defensive when it is proposed to relinquish, or to share the property and power with others. This love of place and power is one of the most subtle and constant obstacles to a union of the Church. It is like an attack upon the privileged classes in social and political life. The ecclesiastical organization as well as the missionary and educational organizations within the Church are treasured not only for their ecclesiastical distinctions but also for their financial worth and social prestige. If there is to be a merging of the great Christian forces into one great Church then there must be a realignment of possessions, of men and of positions. The natural ambition of various bishops and presidents and secretaries of boards to hold their offices and the resultant emoluments will be one of the greatest obstacles in securing the unity of the Church. The note of self-effacement and of absolute devotion to the ideal Church will be required on the part of those who now profit by the present dissevered Church. This will probably be the final ground to be surrendered to the larger ideal of unity. Not until we

are able to say with the apostle "I count all things but loss that I may win Christ," can we look for that renunciation which will be demanded for the securing of our longed-for unity.

There are two further thoughts that I would like to add to what already has been said. This country has a special contribution to make in the solution of this problem of organic Church unity. The rise of the great historical churches of the Reformation was conditioned by isolation and misunderstandings due to the geographical separations, varying political governments, linguistic differences, and racial antagonisms. These old world religious organizations were transplanted to this country and brought face to face in a new environment. Here no state religion was tolerated. A common language was a bond for all the peoples. The rapid change of residence made possible an unusual mingling of citizens. The constant contact of one denominational group with another revealed the good points in each to all. The United States is a land where race hatreds die and men recognize the fundamental human note in all peoples. Further, the federal form of government under which we live has made clear the possibilities of various states existing under one sovereignty. This federal note in the political life of our country naturally gives color and suggestion as to the religious life among the various factions of Protestantism. This is America's dual contribution to the solution of our problem.

Let us remember the ideal and prayer of Jesus concerning the Kingdom, and our problem of the united Church will seem less difficult and impossible. He stressed not the creed, not the organization, not the cult of a church but the personal relation to Him, the vital

moral quality of our religious life, the universality of our interests and love, and the affectional depth of our attachments to Him and to one another. The greatest heresy always is lack of love.

Here I would like to condense a paragraph of Principal Forsyth. The movement for Church unity is hampered by a lack of a true theory of the nature of the Church. The unity of the Church rests on a basis not subjective but objective. It does not stand on Christian sympathies and affinities, but on divine deed and purpose. It rests upon God's grace and Gospel, not on fraternal love—which God will see to it if we see to His grace and trust it more than our love. The Church is primarily the result of an act of God. It is a divine creation, not a voluntary association. Its unity was created by the one Gospel, not the many sacraments which are but modes of the published Word. The same act which sets us in Christ sets us also in the Society of Jesus. Historically the Church was one before it was many. The Society created by the one God, the one Saviour, the one salvation, was one as it left the divine hand. That unity was not put together by organization. The Church is not an organization but an organism. It was born one. Unity cannot rest on polity. The unity is not of structure but of life, not of fabric but of faith. Unless we can postulate in good faith this fundamental concept of the Church all conferences and affinities and subjective likenesses will prove futile as means in our recovery of a real unity of believers.

Reunion will come slowly. Distrust, littleness of soul and the ignorance of other types of Christian life are to be overcome. The pride of mind and of heart must be subdued. The opposed interests that will not sur-

render positions and powers must perish. The inertia of worldliness must be transformed into the energy of faith. But, though these things will be accomplished slowly, the main purpose will be realized. The world needs this demonstration of Christ's indwelling. The Church will perish without it. GOD has planned it; therefore, though the movement lags, it is inevitable, because it is in accord with His Providence, and His determined plan.

Edwin Heyl Delk.

CONGREGATIONALISTS AND DISCIPLES

Prepared by Hubert C. Herring, D.D., and Henry C. Armstrong, B.D., as a Special Committee.*

To the Commissions of Congregationalists and Disciples who have been studying the characteristic features of the two bodies it appears highly important that there should be a clearer, general recognition of their points of agreement and a sustained endeavor to cultivate close relations of sympathy and coöperation. It is not in the thought of these Commissions that such endeavor should take the form of proposals of union, either now or at any assignable future date. The first necessity in the whole matter of the reunion of Christendom is to secure mutual confidence and whole-hearted coöperation. Whatever of closer relationship lies beyond may well be left to the wisdom of the coming time.

As a contribution to such quickened sense of kinship the Commissions present this study. They would remind those who may read it that in order to get the right perspective as to some of the views presented it is essential to remember that one of the communions considered has three hundred years of existence behind it, the other a little less than a hundred. Differences of form and outlook resulting from the difference in age should not be permitted to obscure root agreements which are independent of time.

---

*The work of this special committee has been revised by the two commissions of the Congregationalists and Disciples dealing on Christian unity, and is now published with their approval. The commission of the Congregationalists is as follows: Raymond Calkins, D.D., Chairman, Prof. L. F. Anderson, F. Q. Blanchard, D.D., Nehemiah Boynton, D.D., E. Lyman Hood, D.D., Newman Smyth, D.D., and Williston Walker, Ph.D. The commission of the Disciples is as follows: Peter Ainslie, D.D., Chairman, Carey E. Morgan, M.A., F. D. Kershner, LL.D., H. C. Armstrong, B.D., E. B. Bagby, B.D., F. W. Burnham, LL.D., I. S. Chenoweth, M.A., Finis S. Idleman, D.D., Z. T. Sweeney, LL.D., B. A. Abbott, B.A., H. M. Bell, LL.D., E. M. Bowman, Esq., C. M. Chilton, D.D., J. H. Garrison, LL.D., J. H. Goldner, B. A., F. A. Henry, LL.B., T. C. Howe, Ph.D., W. P. Lipscomb, Esq., R. A. Long, Esq., Eli H. Long, M.D., C. S. Medbury, D.D., C. C. Morrison, B.A., A. B. Philputt, D.D., E. L. Powell, LL.D., W. F. Richardson, LL.D., and I. J. Spencer, LL.D.

In the matter of historical purpose and origin there is a striking parallel. Both were at the outset definitely and avowedly reform movements, having the same purpose in view and following the same general method. What the Separatist and independent movements undertook to do in England, and continued to do in New England, the Disciple movement undertook to do in the region where it began, namely, to deliver the Church from the trammels of ecclesiasticism, tradition and superstition, and to restore the purity and simplicity of the New Testament order. In this we see at work in both bodies the same spirit operating through the same general methods, with this difference—the Congregational reform was aimed at the political ecclesiasticism of the age and its attendant evils, doctrinal and social; while the Disciple reform was aimed at the prevailing sectarianism of a later age and its attendant evils. Historically, then these two bodies sprang from the conviction that in the spirit and purpose of New Testament teaching there is a basis for the faith, polity and life of the Church and both seeking such complete reform as would bring about the adoption of that ideal, aiming in fact to carry the Protestant Reformation to its logical conclusion. The method pursued in both movements was that of separation for the purpose of bearing witness to the truth of the ideas espoused. Thus in the days of Queen Elizabeth the earliest Congregationalists withdrew from attendance upon the Church of England for reasons of faith and conscience, joined themselves together "as the Lord's free people" into "a church estate in the fellowship of the Gospel." In like manner Thomas Campbell and his associates a century and a half later, separating from the Seceder Presbyterian Church, organized them-

selves into the "Christian Association of Washington" for the purpose of promoting "simple, evangelical Christianity, free from all mixture of human opinions and invention." From these beginnings these two movements known as the Congregationalists and the Disciples have come.

In matters of doctrine and polity the agreements between these two people are numerous and significant.

1. They are in entire agreement with each other and with the great company of evangelical Christians in the acceptance of the historic body of the Christian faith which from age to age the various branches of the church have sought to express through their hymns and prayers and creeds.

2. Both hold that the New Testament order is democratic and congregational. Therefore both insist on the independence and autonomy of the local congregation, and both insist on the individual and universal priesthood of believers. Christ is the Head of the whole Church and of each church. Each church is free, therefore, to carry on its own work in its own way. Likewise each person individually has free access to the throne of Grace and is individually accountable to Christ. This is the foundation principle of the religion and life of both Congregationalists and Disciples.

3. Both hold that fundamentally the organ of religious knowledge, and of all knowledge, is reason. Therefore both give the primacy to preaching and teaching. Evangelism in both has followed the method of the direct address of the word of truth to the reason and conscience of men and women. Both welcome truth from whatever source and both have but one desire, namely, to know the fullness of the truth concerning the will of God. It is

therefore fundamental with both that religion must be ethical and that religious faith and feeling shall issue in character after the pattern of the character of Christ.

4. Both accept the Holy Scriptures as a revelation of God. Both have cherished the Bible as their most precious possession. Both are willing to stand for the word of Chillingworth, fairly interpreted, that "The Bible and the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." Both agree in making a distinction between the temporary and permanent elements in the Scriptures. Therefore Bible study and teaching have taken among both the historical and expository methods.

5. Both peoples have been champions of popular education. In the very beginning the Congregationalists planted the schoolhouse by the side of the "meeting house." In 1636 they founded Harvard College. Then came Yale, Dartmouth, Oberlin and a host of others, till an extended chain of colleges stretches across the United States. The Disciples also had educational ambitions from the beginning. The final separation and independence of the Disciple movement dates from the year 1832. In 1840 Alexander Campbell established its first college. There are now thirty-five schools and colleges of the Disciples in the United States.

6. Both are thoroughly committed to the missionary programme of the Kingdom. Both have schools, churches, and missionaries in all parts of the earth. Both conceive the last command of our Lord to be the supreme charter and commission of the Church. Dr. Jefferson says, "The church is a body of missionaries." Alexander Campbell said, "The church of right is and ought to be a great missionary society."

7. Both desire the unity of the Church of Christ.

Since it is contrary to the genius and principles of each to state its views in official creeds or declarations, it is not possible to say authoritatively how closely they agree as to the nature of the unity to be sought and expected or the methods used for its promotion. That there is some difference of view in the average thought of the members of the one communion and the other is plain. But the Commissions issuing this statement are persuaded that it is of a sort which will prove no obstacle to a hearty and united endeavor for the fulfillment of Christ's prayer "That they all may be one."

Turning to matters of church practice there are certain further differences to be taken into consideration.

Most conspicuous are those relating to baptism and the Lord's Supper. Here the divergencies are obvious. Nevertheless they are really external and have to do with manner and season more than with meaning and value. Both bodies are nonsacramentarian. Both regard baptism and the Lord's Supper as symbols and attach great value to them, but do not invest them with any sacramentarian mystery or efficacy. The difference has to do with form. Among the Disciples baptism is always administered by immersion. Among Congregationalists sprinkling is the usual form, although other forms are frequently used. Furthermore, the Disciples universally reject the doctrine and practice of infant baptism and regard penitent believers only as scriptural subjects for baptism. Among Congregationalists children as well as adults may receive baptism.

Concerning the Lord's Supper, the difference is simply one of season. The Disciples regard the institution as a weekly one and observe the Supper every Lord's Day. The Congregationalists observe the Supper as

often as the local congregation may elect. The invitation to the Lord's table is the same in both bodies, each admitting Christians without reference to their membership in the communion administering the Supper.

In the light of this brief analysis it is evident that the general custom under which Congregationalists and Disciples join in worship and coöperate in work is based not upon mutual good will but also upon the solid foundation of essential agreement in primary matters of doctrine and polity. The Commissions believe that to a growing company in each communion nothing will bring greater joy than to see the relations between the two bodies growing ever closer in the bonds of such a fellowship as will be the pledge and beginning of the ultimate oneness of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ.

HUBERT C. HERRING AND HENRY C. ARMSTRONG.

THE PROGRESS OF FEDERATION AMONG THE CHURCHES

By Chas. S. Macfarland, D.D., General Secretary of the Federated Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York City.

While Christian unity as a sentiment is everywhere in the air, it is taking perhaps three concrete forms.

The first is that which is expressed by the hierarchy at Rome. It is not our purpose here to discuss this form.

The second is that which finds expression in such movements as the Christian Unity Foundation and the proposed Conference on Faith and Order. For that we pause to offer a sympathetic prayer and to express our hope. Coöperation in service must precede it, or at least go hand in hand with it. Fellowship and unity of action must not wait too long upon it. We must come together for it with enough mutual faith and trust to believe that our aim and work are common.

There is therefore another form of Christian unity which is possible without waiting for any conference on faith and order, and which is absolutely necessary before we can reach the common ground for any such conference. It might be called Christian unity at work. It is a unity, not to be created so much as discovered and interpreted. We already have it. All we need to do is to exercise it.

God has put into our human order the mingling together of unity and diversity. While it is a unity on the one hand which is not uniformity it must also be diversity on the other hand which is not divisiveness. I believe that the movement of which the Federal Council of

the Churches of Christ in America is the most concrete expression is an illustration of this principle of progress.

Federal unity is stronger and more vital than the first form of unity, represented by the Vatican, because it is unity with freedom, and because unity is stronger without uniformity than with it. The social difference between the unity of the Federal Council and the unity of Rome is also thus: With federal unity the Church may give herself for the sake of the world regardless of what becomes of herself, she may give herself for the sake of humanity and not for the sake of herself; while under the unity of Rome she is obliged first of all to take care of her own life. We must be willing to save our life by losing it.

Federal unity, however, recognizes the two principles of progress, differentiation and coherence. It recognizes that the Kingdom of God does not mean solitariness on the one hand or uniform consolidation on the other. It is simply genuine coöperation without regard to the ultimate result to ourselves. It is not trying to get men to think alike or to think together. It is first willing that the army should be composed of various regiments with differing uniforms, with differing banners, and even, if necessary, with different bands of music at appropriate intervals, provided they move together, face the same way, uphold each other, and fight the common foe of the sin of the world with a common love for the Master of their souls, for each other, and for mankind. It is unity without uniformity; diversity without divisiveness; comprehensiveness not competition or compulsion.

Such a Church is absolutely irresistible. According to Biblical arithmetic, if one can chase one thousand, two cannot only put twice as many but ten thousand to flight;

and if you multiply according to this arithmetic until you reach the twenty million Protestant church members in this country, we can gain some estimate of what God intends that we should do.

I have discovered, I think, this interesting fact: that it is possible, almost always, to get the churches into Christian unity, provided you can prevent them from discussing Christian unity. I am not asking men any more to come together from the various churches to hold a conference on the question of Christian unity. I am willing to talk with them upon almost any other subject but that. The important thing is to get them together to show them the common social task—a task which absolutely cannot be done unless they do it together—and leave them to draw their own inference as to their duty, and as to the will of God and the Spirit of Christ.

I have discovered another interesting fact. If you want to have a conference which will be absolutely harmonious, without bitterness or invidious utterance, get men to come together from just as many denominations as you can, like the Quadrennial Council where they met together to face the common task. It is only when men and women of one denomination get together in conference that there is any serious divisive utterance. And the differentiation and distance between the two remotest constituent bodies of the Federal Council are less than the variance between the two wings of any one of them.

This unity we already have. It simply awaits its discovery and use. Federal unity is denominationalism in coöperation. It is the effort to adjust autonomy and corporate action, individuality and social solidarity, liberty and social adaptation. According to the classic defi-

nition of Herbert Spencer, evolution is the process of passing from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to a definite, coherent heterogeneity during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation. Thus the rise and existence of denominations, following the Protestant Reformation, was an indication of progress and not of deterioration.

A study of history, however, reveals another element in evolution—namely, that it is cyclical. Progress is not directly in one direction, it comes through both forward and backward movements. We go a long distance in one direction, we then pause, and to a certain point make a return. We then gather up our renewed forces and move on again.

In theology, we know of thesis and antithesis. First we move in the line of one proposition; then comes a proposition the antithesis of this, and out of the ultimate blending of the two we find harmony and progress.

These various theories of evolution seem applicable to our denominationalism. We have gone pretty far in carrying out the proposition which has resulted in the diversity of denominationalism. Those who hold to Rome have gone equally far, in their antithesis, in the direction of unity. Perhaps we are getting, among our Protestant denominations, to recognize in equal proportion the two principles of evolution and progress which we find everywhere in the natural order—diversity and unity.

Our various denominations and sects arose largely from the demand for freedom, and through much suffering we found our freedom. We are now recognizing as denominations, however, that the highest freedom we possess may be the freedom to give up some of our free-

dom for the sake of the common good. This was the kind of freedom to which Paul referred in his discussion of those denominational differences which had already begun in the Apostolic Church. We are ready to acknowledge, without forgetting perhaps that in our intellectual expression of truth we have been of Apollos or Cephas, that we are all of Christ, and that in allegiance to Him we must maintain or regain unity even in the midst of our diversity. We are following still farther our denominational search for freedom, and are seeking this highest freedom in our modern movements toward Christian unity.

For the past century or two we have been largely building up denominationalism, and now we have discovered the severe truth of the word of Jesus: "He that saveth his life shall lose it, and he that loseth his life for My sake and the Gospel's shall find it." That is the one text and suggests the one sermon for these thirty constituent denominations of the Federal Council and for all other Christian bodies.

Meanwhile one of the most startling of modern discoveries is that we have been so sadly and thoughtlessly wasteful. We have wasted our mineral wealth, squandered our forests, and allowed the mighty forces of our streams to run out into an unheeding sea.

Worse still, in the development of industry, and by social neglect, we have wretchedly wasted our human power and, as our new legislation witnesses, we have been criminally prodigal with human life itself. We have poisoned, neglected, maimed, and mangled by our inefficient speeding up, by our twelve-hour days and seven-day weeks. While we have wasted the forests that make the mines, we have also wasted by thousands our

human brothers in the mines, have slaughtered and despoiled our women, and have consumed our babes beyond the count of Herod in our suffocating cities, while we had half a continent of fresh air. In our commercial development we have sacrificed innocent human life upon its altar and have given over our little children to an industrial Moloch saying, with outstretched iron arms, "Let little children come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Mammon." And if we followers of Christ are content to disavow the blame, let us remember that in the same breath in which the Master said that to neglect these little ones was to forget Himself, He also condemned men, in His most severe and solemn utterance, for the things they didn't do.

But these are not an intimation of the worst of our dissipations, and indeed these wastes have been largely because of a deeper and more serious prodigality. We have let the very light within us become darkness, and the saddest of all has been the waste of our moral powers, our finer emotions, and our religious enthusiasms, through sectarian divisions, denominational rivalries, and unrestrained caprice often deluding itself as a religious loyalty.

If our effort for redemption had been given more fully to prevention, we should not now stand trembling, shamefaced, and bewildered before the results of our own social havoc. Our most serious profligacy has been the neglect to cultivate our ultimate power, the power of our religious enthusiasm and our spiritual impulse, because they were neither socially concentrated nor socially interpreted and applied.

The first approach towards federation was the organization of Christian men and women in various voluntary

organizations, upon particular interests which were obviously common to all the churches. Thus there have arisen, during the past half century, a large number of interdenominational movements, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Young Women's Christian Association, the United Society of Christian Endeavor and various other young people's movements, the Brotherhood of Andrew and Philip and other similar bodies, the Laymen's Missionary Movement, the Student Volunteer Movement, the International Sunday School Association, and other coöperative organizations.

Another type of such movement is represented by the American Bible Society, the American Tract Society, and similar societies whose chief distinctive common characteristic is that they are comprised within the realm of what are known as the Evangelical churches.

A still different type are the various temperance and other reform organizations, as well as a multitude of societies for social and philanthropic work which, while having a less intimate connection with the churches, are almost entirely made up of officials and members of the churches, many of which either tactily or explicitly regard these organizations as expressing the will of the Church.

These movements and organizations, while each concerned with its own special interests, have, at points, found their work to be in common, and have, in their turn, entered into voluntary coöperation.

Later on this general movement assumed a more official character through the Home Missions Boards, resulting ultimately in the Home Missions Council in 1908, the Missionary Education Movement for the common publication of missionary literature, and the Foreign

Missions Conference of North America representing the Foreign Mission interests of the churches. The women's board of missions have organized the Council of Women for Home Missions and the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions. The Sunday-School Council of Evangelical Denominations also belongs in this category.

The organizations which have been named do not complete the entire list, but are mentioned simply as indicating these forms of coöperative denominationalism. They are mainly voluntary movements, and those made up of official organizations are officially representative of those boards and not of the denominations themselves. Most of them are now in coöperation with each other in the Federal Council's Commission on Federated Movements.

Meanwhile other Christian leaders, among whom should be mentioned William Earl Dodge and Dr. Philip Schaff, whose vision and interest comprehended the whole realm of Christian enterprise, organized the Evangelical Alliance, which while it was not an official organization, did, as a matter of fact, within a limited sphere, speak and act for the American churches.

The federative movement, speaking in the stricter sense of the word, began in the local communities, the first federation of churches having been the New York City Federation of Churches, in 1895, and the Massachusetts Federation of Churches in 1902.

At this point mention should be made of the simultaneous movement towards coöperation and federation in the foreign field. Attention should be called to the fact that federation in the home field is largely in the nature of a reflex action from foreign missions. From time to

time, since 1872, when the first conference was held in Yokohama, and the translation of the Bible arranged for, various gatherings of missionaries were held in Japan, looking towards increasing coöperation, the most notable of these being the Osaka Conference in 1881, and the Tokyo Conference in 1900. The transition was so gradual and normal that it would be difficult to determine the date of what might be called the first federation of churches in the foreign field.

The following historical statements are made on the basis of previous reports in which conflicting dates are given: The year in which the first local federation of churches was formed, 1895, at the annual meeting of the Open and Institutional Church League, one of the many interdenominational movements of that time, the secretary of that organization, Rev. E. B. Sanford, in an address calling upon the churches for larger social service, gave prophetic utterance to the call for Christian unity as a sovereign interest in the work of the League.

At about this time, several measures were proposed, and some organizations approached, all looking towards the same end. We may take as an example of these the proposal of the Brotherhood of Andrew and Philip, in 1891 which resulted in the formulation of a constitution which provided for "a Federal Council" whose members were to be appointed officially by the highest judicatories of their representatives on the Executive Councils of denominational brotherhoods, the first federal convention of this organization being held in the Marble Collegiate Church in New York in 1893. The founder of the brotherhood, Rev. Rufus W. Miller, later became a member of the Executive Committee appointed

at Carnegie Hall. Other similar examples might be mentioned.

The first meeting looking directly towards federation was held in New York in 1899. The presiding officer was William E. Dodge of the Evangelical Alliance and its administrative work was performed by Dr. Sanford who ultimately became the corresponding secretary and is now the honorary secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. It authorized action that brought about, in Philadelphia, the next year, the National Federation of Churches, whose membership was composed of representatives of local churches and federations. The Executive Committee of the meeting in 1899 sent forth an utterance propounding the question, "May we not also look forward to a National Federation of all our Protestant Christian denominations, through their official heads, which shall utter a declaration of Christian unity and accomplish in good part the fulfillment of the prayer of our Lord, 'that they all may be one, that the world may know that Thou hast sent Me.' "

At the annual meeting of the National Federation in Washington, in 1902, a Committee of Correspondence was authorized to request the highest ecclesiastical or advisory bodies of the evangelical denominations to appoint representative delegates to a Conference to be held in 1905. This Conference, at Carnegie Hall, New York, adopted the constitution of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which, after ratification by the constituent bodies in its fellowship, brought about the final and complete organization of the Federal Council at Philadelphia in 1908.

The 1905 Conference elected Rev. William H. Roberts

as permanent chairman, and the new federation was really more or less in existence during the period from 1905 to the final organization in 1908, through a permanent executive committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Roberts. Annual reports were published in 1906 and 1907, regarding not only the progress of organization but also the development of the federative movement in local communities and in the foreign field.

Finally, "the meeting of the first Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America was opened in the Academy of Music in Philadelpia at 7:45 P.M., on Wednesday evening, December 2d, the Rev. William Henry Roberts permanent chairman of the Interchurch Conference of 1905 and the chairman of the Executive Committee having charge of the Philadelphia meeting, being the presiding officer."

The distinctiveness of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America lay in the fact that it was not, like the other movements, a voluntary interdenominational fellowship, but an officially and ecclesiastically organized body. This was the ideal clearly in view when the Interchurch Conference was called to convene at Carnegie Hall, New York, in November, 1905. The following is the preamble and the substance of the Plan of Federation adopted by that Conference:

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL

PREAMBLE

Whereas, In the providence of God, the time has come when it seems fitting more fully to manifest the essential oneness of the Christian Churches of America in Jesus Christ as their Divine Lord and Saviour, and to promote the spirit of fellowship, service and coöperation among them, the delegates to the Interchurch Conference on

Federation, assembled in New York City, do hereby recommend the following Plan of Federation to the Christian bodies represented in this Conference for their approval:

PLAN OF FEDERATION

For the prosecution of work that can be better done in union than in separation a Council is hereby established whose name shall be the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America.

The object of this Federal Council shall be—

I. To express the fellowship and catholic unity of the Christian Church.

II. To bring the Christian bodies of America into united service for Christ and the world.

III. To encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches.

IV. To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.

V. To assist in the organization of local branches of the Federal Council to promote its aims in their communities.

This Federal Council shall have no authority over the constituent bodies adhering to it; but its province shall be limited to the expression of its counsel and the recommending of a course of action in matters of common interest to the churches, local councils and individual Christians. It has no authority to draw up a common creed or form of government or of worship, or in any way to limit the full autonomy of the Christian bodies adhering to it.

The following restatement of principles underlying and guiding the work of the Federal Council was

adopted by the Executive Committee at its annual meeting in Baltimore, December, 1913:

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

Its Distinctive Character in Relation to the Denominations.

The difference between the Federal Council and organizations of similar general purpose which preceded it is that it is not an individual or voluntary agency or simply an interdenominational fellowship, but it is a body officially constituted by the churches.

Its differentiation from the other movements looking towards unity is that it brings together the various denominations for union in service rather than in polity or doctrinal statement.

The original delegates to the Interchurch Conference on Federation, which organized the Federal Council, felt that these limitations were necessary in order that such an organization might have adequate strength and momentum.

Its Representative Character.—The Federal Council is, therefore, the sum of all its parts. It is not an unrelated organization. Its function has been to express the will of its constituent bodies and not legislate for them. Were this, however, to be construed as precluding the utterance of the voice of the churches upon matters in regard to which the consciousness and the conscience of Christianity are practically unanimous, the Federal Council would be shorn of the power given it by the constituent bodies when they adopted as one of its objects: "To secure a larger combined influence for the churches of Christ in all matters affecting the moral and social condition of the people, so as to promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life."

Denominational Autonomy.—In the original Plan of Federation the autonomy of the constituent bodies is, however, wisely safeguarded. No action by the Federal Council, even though taken, as all its important actions have been taken, by the unanimous vote of the officially constituted delegates of the constituent bodies, can, by

the terms of its constitution, be legally imposed upon those constituent bodies. Such action, by the terms of the constitution, goes back to the constituent bodies in the form of a recommendation for their action or ratification, which may either be assumed or definitely expressed.

It is, however, clearly the duty and the function of the Council to determine upon objects for such common action and to find appropriate expression of the consciousness and the conscience of the churches upon them.

Functions of the Council.—While the duties of the Council are thus, with these safeguards and limitations, to represent the churches upon important matters of common concern, and in the sentences above indicated, to exercise a genuine leadership which recognizes the whole body of its constituency, the Council may not consider itself primarily as an independent entity, but rather as a common ground upon which the constituent bodies through their official delegates come together for coöperation.

Under this conception the Federal Council does not create new agencies to do the work of the churches, nor does it do the work of the denominations or the churches for them. Its policy is that of using the existing agencies, and this policy should be followed out with relation to the interdenominational movements which are recognized by the churches. In the main, however, these existing agencies are the constituent bodies themselves and their official boards and departments.

It is, therefore, the function of the Council, not so much to do things, as to get the denominational bodies and the interdenominational movements to do the work of the churches in coöperation. Here its function is not that of overseer and director, but that of an agency for the correlation and the coördination of existing forces and organizations, and so far as it may be permitted, it is to recommend, give guidance and point out the way.

Relation to Local Federative Agencies.—With relation to State and Local Federations the Plan of Federation distinctly, it is held by many, intended that the Federal Council should be the initiator, creator, inspirer,

and, so far as possible, the directing agency of such federations.

There is, however, no organic relation between the Federal Council and State and Local Federations, and it can assume no responsibility for the constituency of such federations or the form which they may take, or indeed any responsibility, except so far as they may carry out the principles and the policy of the Council.

Commissions.—These same principles of policy apply to the various commissions appointed by the Council. They act always as agents of the Council and distinctly represent themselves as such. They also hold themselves as subject to the Executive committee of the Council in accordance with the by-laws of the Council.

Like the Council itself, these commissions, in relation to the denominational agencies, regard themselves as the sum of all their parts.

The Council thus seeks to find the will of the constituent bodies and their departments and to interpret and express it in common terms. The Council then aims to secure the doing of the will and conscience of the constituent bodies by common and united action.

The coöperation implied in the fellowship of the Federal Council does not require any one of the constituent bodies to participate in such coöperative movements as may not be approved by it or for which its methods of organization and work may not be adapted.

As your Committee review the history of the Council and the actions of the Council, its Executive Committee, its commissions and its national office, we find that to a remarkable degree these principles have been closely followed in a way that has brought about effective utterance and action without division or disintegration, and we heartily commend in these respects the administration of the Council, its committees and its Executive administration.

The Federal Council meets quadrennially and consists of about four hundred qualified delegates officially elected by the various denominational assemblies or other constituted authorities. Its Executive Committee

consists of about ninety of these delegates and acts for the Council during the Quadrennium between its sessions, holding regular meetings. The Executive Committee has an Administrative Committee, holding regular monthly meetings, which acts for the Executive Committee between its sessions. The national office and its executives, under the Administrative Committee, carry on the continuous work of the Council. The Council appropriately maintains an office in Washington, D. C., and has become an incorporated body under the laws of the District of Columbia.

The period from 1905 to the final organization of the Council in 1908 was occupied in consultation with the thirty denominations invited to constitute the council and in securing the official election or appointment of representative members. The quadrennium from 1908 to 1912 was a period largely of experimentation. The Executive Committee necessarily moved slowly and cautiously in the effort to make the adjustment between federation and denominational autonomy. Much effort was given to the development of state and local federations, the nation being divided into districts in charge of district secretaries. This method, however, did not avail. The cities and towns were not prepared for federation. Many therefore of the federations organized were short-lived. It became apparent that the council would need to develop first the spirit of federation before it could proceed to successful local organization. At the quadrennial meeting in December, 1912, in Chicago, the work began anew. At that time, the central organization consisted of two modest offices with one secretary, a stenographer and one or two clerical assistants.

The Federal council is developing its functions somewhat as follows:

First of all, it is a clearing house for denominational and interdenominational activities. Second, it speaks and acts in a representative capacity for the Evangelical churches of America which constitute the Council. It acts for the churches in several departments of work through commissions and committees made up largely from the various boards and departments of its constituent bodies. It develops local federations in cities and towns.

1. Federal Council as a clearing house.

During the past four years, the Central organization has developed, now occupying over thirty office rooms, maintains a printing and publication department of considerable magnitude with fairly adequate machinery for reaching all the churches upon very short notice. Nine executive and field secretaries give their entire time to this united work of the churches, all of them being regarded as experts in their particular spheres. Several of the denominational secretaries give part time to the service of the Council. The central office maintains a staff of about forty assistants. The work of the secretaries consists of the visitation of denominational gatherings and local federations, the coördination of the work of the various commissions for the purpose of inspiring and stimulating coöperation among the churches. Contact is maintained with all the churches and the central office is rapidly becoming a general bureau of information, issuing year books and similar publications.

The council has the beginnings of a religious publicity bureau. Important causes are taken up and furthered, common movements are generated and the cen-

tral administration is becoming a general power house for the churches. The office at Washington gives constant consideration to the interests of the churches which naturally center at the national capital such as the appointment of chaplains, the care of the army and navy, the religious census and similar concerns. It should be noted that while the pastors are receiving constant communications from the office of the Federal Council, they are appeals very diversified in nature and simply represent the multitude of legitimate interests which center in the council. They represent economy in ecclesiastical administration because all of these lines of work are carried on at one administrative expense instead of being carried on separately at greatly increased cost.

2. The representative capacity of the Federal Council.

The functions of the Federal Council in its representative capacity have not been determined. Its administration attempts to represent the churches upon matters where substantial unanimity is obvious. It exercises this representative capacity by utterances in behalf of the churches; by messages upon matters of common concern; by the appointment of appropriate national days of prayer and by the issuing of common subjects for the week of prayer, both at the beginning of the year and at Easter time. It undertakes certain activities in the name of the churches, such as the religious work in connection with the Panama Pacific exposition, the celebration of the American Peace Centenary, the celebration of the Protestant Reformation, the cóöperative movement for war relief and such work as is done in coöperation with the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship.

The recent special meeting of the council at Wash-

ington was a significant illustration of the exercise of its representative capacity. This meeting issued a message for the hour, prepared a common programme for works of mercy, for the moral and religious welfare of the army and navy, for the development of the work of the chaplains and for the conservation of the social, moral and spiritual forces of the nation. This function of the council is illustrated by its comprehensive campaign for the conservation of human life which includes both the spiritual and the social factors necessary to such a movement. From time to time, new movements are projected such as the occasion may demand.

3. National and international undertakings.

The various fields of service are covered by commissions. These are constituted, first by the appointment of members representing the constituent denominations, to which are added men and women who are regarded as experts in their respective fields.

The commission on evangelism endeavors to stimulate the evangelistic spirit, to secure the organization of denominational commissions on evangelism, to coördinate the work of these commissions and thus to bring about a nation-wide spirit and movement of evangelism.

The commission on the church and social service has formulated a statement of social objectives which has become almost a classic in the world of social endeavor. Denominational commissions have been organized and have been brought into coöperative action. This commission has formed a connecting link between the churches and the various social movements, thus increasing the social spirit among the churches and infusing the social movements with the Christian spirit.

The commission on temperance has brought its work

into coöperation with the historical National Temperance Society and the two bodies now think and act as one. The immediate programme now in operation includes the agitation for prohibition during the war, a movement for the abolition of the use of liquor at college and university commencements, a workingman's fellowship among labor organizations, an advertising campaign in the labor papers, a movement among society women for the discontinuance of the use of liquor at social functions, and other similar movements. The commission publishes five monthly temperance periodicals including one for workingmen and two for young people.

The commission on international justice and goodwill was instrumental in securing the endowment by Mr. Carnegie of the Church Peace Union and the organization of the World Alliance for Promoting International Friendship through the Churches. It has published hand-books, lesson courses and similar material for educating and organizing the sentiment of the churches.

The commission on Christian education faces a complex task because of the multitude of interdenominational bodies working in this department and it is endeavoring at the present moment to bring them into effective coöperation. Among the special matters with which the commission is now dealing is that of the relation between religious instruction and the public school system. The commission has published two series of lessons on international peace with a hand-book for the use of pastors and teachers.

In the realm of home missions, the Home Missions Council is a coöperating body with the Federal Council. The Home Missions Council is made up of repre-

sentatives of the denominational home mission boards in the interests of effective distribution and the adequate care of home mission interests.

The commission on the church and country life has up to the present time occupied itself mainly with surveys of rural church conditions, the last one being in the state of Ohio bringing to light facts which are so startling that some improvement will surely issue as the result of survey.

The committee on foreign missions coöperates with the Conference of Foreign Mission Boards of North America. Its recent report to the Quadrennial meeting of 1916 records a remarkable progress during the last decade in foreign fields which the churches at home might well take as an example. If we were to go out into this realm, however, with the story of the Edinburgh Conference and the Panama Congress, we should have a book instead of an article.

The Federal Council, from time to time, according to the call of the occasion, appoints special commissions, such as the commission on relations with Japan whose work has been so noteworthy. This commission has been enlarged to a commission on relations with the Orient. Other committees operating with perhaps less effectiveness up to the present time are those on ministerial relief and sustenation, on family life and religious rest day and a recent committee appointed by the Executive Committee to care especially for the interests of the Negro churches and people.

From time to time, organizations are perfected to meet the needs of the hour, such as the committee on the celebration of the Protestant Reformation, the committee on various interests related to the war, the commit-

tee on Christian work in the Canal Zone, and various committees for the relief of Protestant churches and missions in Europe and the committee on war relief and the work of the Red Cross.

4. Local Federation.

The work of the present commission on Inter-Church Federations grew largely out of the men and religion movement, and has as its chairman and executive secretary the men who occupied the same positions in that movement. The so-called district system did not meet with adequate success because the various communities differ widely in their readiness for federation. The commission is now approaching communities where the circumstances give promise of effective procedure. The ground is prepared in advance by adequate investigation and consultation. Federations in cities and towns of substantial size are not advised unless the churches are ready to take the matter seriously to establish an office for the federation, to raise a budget and employ a secretary. At the present time there are about twenty-five or thirty really effective federations. In the smaller towns where it is not possible to have administrative machinery, the commission demands that the pastors and laymen shall give the federation the earnest and serious attention and service which it demands. Local correspondents are now being secured for every city and town in the country.

In October a representative congress will be held at Pittsburgh for which long and careful preparation has been made in the effort to at least approach the standardization of the work and functions of local federations. In justice to the principle of ecclesiastical economy, it should be noted that all of these operations are

carried on under one administration and at an expense which would be multiplied many times were this work being done by thirty bodies instead of by one.

At the special meeting of the council at Washington, President Henry Churchill King expressed the belief that the Council had been born for just such a National hour as this. Previous to this time, the chaplains in the army and navy have been appointed rather indiscriminately often through political channels, and without very much concern on the part of the churches.

Now, the secretaries of War and the Navy have at their hand in Washington a body representing all the churches with which they can deal. When the missionaries in Japan have occasion to plead their cause before the American churches, they have a body to whom they can come. When the Red Cross needs the service of Christian people the organization turns instinctively to the Federal Council. The Protestant churches of war-stricken Europe find an open door to American Christainity. The persecuted Jews can here seek consideration for their wrongs; the religious census department finds it necessary to keep in constant communication with the Washington office of the Council; the social workers, the officers of the organizations for war relief and similar toilers in the world's work are our daily visitors.

Progress, to be sure, is not necessarily indicated by statistics, and yet, perhaps they indicate something. Four years ago, the quadrennial reports constituted one moderate volume; the reports of the quadrennium just closed constitute six rather voluminous books. Especially since the beginning of the war, the relationships between the churches of America and Europe have deepened and it is interesting to note that invitations have

come to the Federal Council from Holland and France to send messengers and counsellors to help the Protestant churches of these countries toward more intimate coöperative organization and action.

Probably most of the leaders of the Christian denominations would agree with the affirmation of the committee of fifteen which was appointed to present a survey of the work of the council, that whatever decrease there may be of the sectarian spirit, the work of the Federal Council has not impaired the strength of the denominations and has not interfered with their legitimate autonomy. The federative movement probably has not stimulated denominationalism as such but it has surely brought strength to denominational activities and has enlarged their boundaries.

CHAS. S. MACFARLAND.

THE BASIS, METHOD AND ASSURANCE OF CHRISTIAN UNION

By I. J. Spencer, LL.D., Minister Central Christian Church, Lexington, Ky.

Jesus prayed for union. Men argue for it. Jesus taught that it must have a personal basis. Men have proceeded upon the theory that the foundation must be doctrinal. Our Saviour indicated that union must come from above. Men have thought it could be manufactured on earth. Christian union must proceed from within outward and not from without inward. The uniformity observable in any denomination is not the union for which Jesus prayed. While visible unity was contemplated in the Lord's petition in the seventeenth of John, that the world might believe, it was to be far more than a visibility. It was to be a union visible and manifest in the human through the influx of the Divine—"that they may be one just as we are one." It must come through "the glory" that comes from the Father through the Son. Unity is not the antithesis of variety. There may be the most transcendent unity with the most beautiful diversity. There cannot be luxuriant growth without luxuriant variety. Without variety there cannot be liberty. But both the liberty and the variety must spring from Christ as the Root. "In faith, unity; in opinion, liberty" is a suggestive motto.

One of the essential conditions of Christian union is knowledge. I do not think the right understanding of God and His will has received the consideration and cultivation it deserves. The life of the Ages consists in knowing the only true God and Jesus Christ whom He sent. The reason assigned for the office of apostles,

prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers, in the fourth chapter of Ephesians, was to bring all "unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a full grown man," that they being no longer children, tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine; but educated in the truth and speaking it in love might grow up into Christ as the head of the Body, every member doing his part for the increase and edification of the Body in love.

Suppose that all denominations were supremely devoted to the task of learning the adequate Scriptural character of Christ in order to obey Him. Is there any conceivable method by which they could better approximate the heavenly unity for which the Saviour prayed? The Lord's people are destroyed for lack of knowledge, now as they were in the days of Hosea. The value of spiritual knowledge is emphasized over and over again in the Word of God. The apostle of love delighted to dwell upon what he determined the knowledge of God. We know that no one who is a child of God lives in sin. We know that we are children of God. We know we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren. We know that when He shall appear we shall be like Him. We know the true One, and are in union with the true One. The apostle of faith concludes his last epistle with the admonition to grow in the grace and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

The apostle to the Gentiles prayed that his brethren might be rooted and grounded in love and might be able to apprehend the breadth, length, height and depth of the love of Christ which passeth knowledge. To know Him and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His suffering, is to be in Him, as a living stone in His temple. While praying: "Thy kingdom come;

Thy will be done," it is important to remember that His kingdom cannot come and His will cannot be done except through the knowledge of Christ and His Word. When the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of God as the waters cover the sea, there shall be the unity for which our Lord prayed.

Preachers and teachers are holding up before the churches certain kinds of instruction that when compared with Scriptural illumination are as brass to gold. When George Müller, of Bristol, discovered the priceless pearls of truth in the Bible he sold his library and gave his heart to searching the Scriptures daily.

The good is often the enemy of the best. The best literature, produced by human genius, when compared with the Scriptures is as shadow to substance. Those who strive to get themselves and all their brethren into the unity of the Spirit will strive wisely if they will give themselves to the diligent, docile study of God's Word and to the business of teaching it to others. As we come to know that the Scriptures testify of Christ, that He is their burden and their King of glory, we will come more and more into His life and will realize that all who are truly in Him are truly one.

In the next place it is important to remember that the supreme requisite is love. Faith initiates but love carries the burden. Love wins others into its companionship. It is astonishing how many diversities love can cement. The Chicago fire fused thousands of steel implements into great metallic masses. The electric current passed through oxygen and hydrogen gases forms water. The love that filled God's heart and brought Him into incarnation is beating at the door of every human heart eager to flow in and make men fit units in the unity for which Jesus prayed. "Lovest thou me?" was a later

and greater question than "Who say ye that I am?" Put knowledge, faith, eloquent utterance and heroic sacrifice as corner stones of the temple and it will still stand deserted and crumbling. But enswathe and fill it with love and it will shine like the New Jerusalem. The church, in order to conquer, must be clothed with the sun, with its fire and its consequent illumination. The mind illustrated by celestial knowledge and the heart ablaze with love for God and one's neighbor are the steeds that must draw the chariot of the sun that shines for all, warms all and wins all.

The Christian union problem is a simple one. First it requires that its subjects shall be Christian and, second, that they shall be united in their knowledge of and love toward Christ. The method is through knowledge, prompted and sustained by love exercised daily after the Spirit of Jesus Christ.

Out of such a love springs obedience even to the dominion of the thoughts of the heart. One of the most advanced concepts of the Christian life in its pilgrimage of duty is stated, in the tenth chapter of Second Corinthians with reference to the soul's warfare against internal evil, as the casting down of imaginations, and every high thing that is exalted against the knowledge of God, and "bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ."

There are many humanisms in our churches and in our theology and creeds. We are at liberty to surrender these. I have no right to erect sectarian walls. Where Christ has not spoken I have no authority to speak. Where he has spoken I have no right to keep silent. He is the all-in-all of the intelligent Christian. What He has commanded is in the nature of trust funds. I must keep them inviolate and use them as the faithful stewards

used their entrusted talents. Since the forces of evil and falsity are closely and determinedly allied against the Church, the bride of Christ, why not ally ourselves under the one, sufficient and Divine banner as the militant followers of Him who says: "What is that," or that or that, "to thee? Follow thou me."

I may surrender my bigotry, my self-love and my conceit. I may yield my worldly traditions and ambitions. I may even love my father and mother, wife and children, less than I love Jesus, and my patriotism to the kingdom of God will shine the brighter. But I must not take away from the prophecies of the Book of God nor allow my vision of the Father to be dimmed nor my loyalty to suffer diminution.

There is a notion that for the sake of union one should be very liberal in his religious views; that he should be very tolerant of others' convictions. So one may be in non-essentials. But if Christ be Christ, and be all He claimed to be, no one can be a Christian and be disloyal to His doctrine. He may not understand it as others accept it. He may be backward in knowledge but advanced in love and if so should be received "without doubtful disputations."

I believe in leniency toward the ignorant, for we are not all-wise and must be solicitous ourselves for compassion toward our ignorance and errors. But like our Master, who went forward in knowledge, in wisdom and obedience, ever compassionate toward the ignorant, we must neither halt nor hesitate in following Him.

I would write the term Christian union with all the emphasis of the Scriptures upon Christ out of whom alone Christian union can spring. Union may be, like knowledge, either a good or a bad thing. But a union

arising out of the life of Christ, founded upon Him, inspired by Him, cleansed and perfected by Him; and as loyal to Him as the ideal virgin is single-hearted toward her betrothed (2 Cor. 11:3),—such I conceive to be the unity for which our heavenly Master prayed.

"Closer to Thee, my Father draw me" that I may be instrumental in drawing others to Thy side. As a grain of wheat Jesus fell into the earth and died that he might bear fruit; and, being lifted up, might draw all men unto him. We are the ordained channels through which He desires to draw the world unto Himself. It is useless to talk of Christian union except we reckon Christ as the principle of that union. It is vain to think of it as a human product. We may indeed endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. But the unity is the unity of the Spirit of God. Christ in us is "the hope of glory" and Christ in us is likewise the hope of Christian unity, a unity that can be seen and felt; genuine in its quality and irresistible in its operation.

It is evident that if Christian union must come down from above, as Jacob's ladder came, and not from below as the vain tower of Babel, we advocates of unity have no ground for boasting nor room for any pride. We have only that which we have received. Of ourselves we can do nothing. The most becoming dress for us to wear is the clothes of humility. This humility is the fruit of knowledge and experience. We are as vessels in the hands of the divine potter that the glory may be of God and not of men. We must decrease that Christ may increase.

He alone is the sufficient magnet to draw all men into loyal and loving subjection to His will and His kingdom. But He scorns not to use us as branches of the vine, as vessels meet for His use; as fishers and shepherds of men.

In addition to spiritual knowledge in abundance, and as accurate as possible; in addition to love, not for self and the world, but for God and our brethren; in addition to loyalty extending even to the thoughts that fly or brood like birds in our souls; and in addition to the humility which Jesus taught by the example of a little child and by His own lowly suffering and service, there must be allowed full liberty in Christ Jesus in the enjoyment of Christian union.

Many battles have been fought and rivers of blood have been shed for freedom. First there must be liberty within and then there may be liberty without. To remove the yoke of bondage from men as citizens of a political kingdom does not set them free. Even education and the very refinement of human culture cannot release the soul from its inner bondage. It is obedience to perfect law that makes men free indeed. The Jews in the days of Jesus' sojourn among them, said they had never been in bondage to any man. But the Lord told them they were enslaved by sin. He said that His disciples should know the truth and the truth would make them free. Concerning the character of that freedom He declared that whom the Son of God makes free is free indeed.

Here is ground again for a mighty appeal to know the Lord. To know Him makes other knowledge poor and mean. To know Him is to find the pearl for which one is willing to sell all that he hath. To know Him is to love Him and to love Him makes obedience sweet and brings the liberty which He promised. But, saith the Spirit, use not your liberty as an occasion to the flesh. Upon Christ, the one foundation, and upon Him only must rise the shining temple of Christian union. Arch above arch, stone upon stone, gallery above gallery, story upon story

to the crown of consummation the structure is ascending. Already the glory of the Lord is potent within its walls. The intelligent, the loyal, the humble, the loving and the free are even now united in Him. The New Jerusalem, "a city compact together," is already here. We rejoice and acknowledge that, notwithstanding the sectarian tents round about Zion; notwithstanding the ecclesiastical edifices that obscure the heavenly city; notwithstanding the bondage and the darkness of the churches, Jesus' prayer is being answered and His followers are becoming one in Him. "Not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, saith the Lord of hosts."

I. J. Spencer.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PULPIT

THE HIGHER UNITY

By William Pierson Merrill, D.D., Minister Brick Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Wherefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's.—*I. Corinthians* 3:21, 22, 23.

Were the Apostle Paul to come back to earth in bodily form to mingle again in the affairs of Christians, nothing would amaze him more than to find himself regarded by many as a patron saint of the narrow-minded. All through his life as a Christian he fought for a big, broad, generous theology and for a church policy daringly comprehensive and catholic. But all through the ages since he has been claimed as the champion of an intolerant and exclusive Christianity. Knowing him as we do from the letters he has left, we are sure that this fact would not only amaze him; it would irritate him; and he would probably use vehement language to express his feelings, as he did when protesting against the Judaizers of his own era.

As a matter of fact there is, in the thought and words of Paul, a breadth and a range that go far beyond the reach of many who in our own day are dubbed "radicals" in theology or in their views of church policy. In such a text as this which comes before us to-day are a sweep and a boldness which almost take our breath away.

Let us go without reserve, for this once, just as far as Paul's words may lead us. Granting that one passage

of Scripture needs to be set in the light of other passages, let us leave the correcting largely for other occasions, and try to get the full force of what the apostle says to us in these great verses.

His words take on additional significance from the fact that they were written to a church in which narrowness and partisanship were rampant. The church in Corinth was split into fragments, one calling itself by the name of "Paul," another by the name of "Apollos," another by that of "Peter," while a fourth group dared call itself the "Christ" party. Paul is trying to lift them all out of the low places where each is supremely concerned over its own petty fences, up to a height where they may realize their unity. Down at the base of the mountain men dwell apart, and each comes readily to think that his own little strip of territory is the best. Set them all climbing, and, though each keeps straight by his own track, all come at last to the single mountain top, owned by them all. There they may realize their essential unity. So Paul leads Christians up to the great realities in which they are one, that they may feel throughout their lower and divided interests a deep sense of that real unity which is theirs.

The text is a series of mighty steps. Each leads to something higher. And the clear implication is that the higher are also the more important. Or, to change the figure, the text shows us a series of rooms, each opening into a larger; and the larger is ever more important than the smaller. One trouble with the church has been that churchmen have been so inclined to reverse that judgment, and to think that the smaller the room the more important it is. The ancient Hebrew built his tabernacle, and later his temple, on that theory. As one moved in

from the outer courts, through the inner courts, through the holy place, to the Holy of Holies, he was getting nearer to the sanctities of religion, nearer to God and to the heart of faith.

It is a natural instinct of man's heart to judge thus that the smaller places are the more holy, that we come nearer to God as our religion narrows, and that therefore the more particular and individual elements of our religion are the more important parts of it. We forget that the veil of the temple was rent, and the Hebrew policy was reversed, when the Gospel of Jesus came. Christ turned men's thoughts away from a narrowing to a broadening process, in their efforts to find God.

We are likely to think in some such way as this: We find God in the world, in the broad thoughts of common humanity. But we find Him far more truly and really in the distinctive tenets of the Christian faith. We find Him still more truly in the doctrines of our own denomination. Within that denomination we get nearer to the true God in the thoughts and practices of the particular wing or set to which we belong. And each one of us finds God most truly in his own heart, his personal experience.

There is a truth, and a great one, in that estimate. Beyond question, we do gain in the intensity and vividness of our religion, as we move in from the universal to the particular, from the thought of God and the faith in God common to humanity to the God-experience of the individual soul. But when we claim that the individual thought, or the denominational faith, is most important, that it must be upheld even at the cost of a shattered Christendom, that we are moving away from, and not toward, the great and important realities of religion as we move up toward the bigger unities, then we are not

only failing to follow Christ; we are not even following Paul.

For this is Paul's way of classifying the elements of our religious faith and thought in the order of their ascending importance; all things belong to you, differences of thought and practice, denominational peculiarities, schools of thought and feeling and experience, all belong to you; and you belong to Christ; and Christ belongs to God. Does not that clearly imply that, as he views the matter, our private, personal, and denominational views, practices, creeds, and all the rest, have validity and importance only in so far as they serve Christ and advance His aims; and that Christ has worth for humanity only in so far as He and His Gospel serve to make men know God? The ultimate reality is God. The ultimate aim is that men shall know God. Christ is here, and Christianity is here, to help men find God. And we are here, and our particular denomination is here, to serve Christ in that great effort. And all our possessions are in our control, and all our powers of soul are ours, in order that we may be the more fit and the more ready to serve God through Christ.

Is not that what the words mean? Can they mean anything else? Are they not a protest against all attempts of little religious interests to take precedence over big ones, a challenge to all narrow, exclusive claims on the part of any particularistic theology or churchmanship? If the text does not mean that, what does it mean? And if it does mean that, then it destroys the right of any and every denomination to exist, except as a sincere and devoted effort to realize the church as Christ thought of it.

If every branch of the church of Christ should frankly and fully adopt that principle, the evils of denomina-

tional division would be cut away at a stroke. What holds the branches of the church apart is not chiefly our varying views as to what is essential to Christianity, but our insistence on something more than that which we count essential to Christianity. Until we come to a frank admission that no denomination has a right to insist on anything in its faith or practice beyond what it deems essential to common Christianity, we are not fit to discuss Christian unity. Church unity is simply waiting for us to be Christians, to count common Christianity as more important and decisive than Presbyterian theology, or Episcopalian order, or Baptist immersion. Any man whom we acknowledge as a Christian minister ought to be acknowledged as fit to be a minister in any branch of the church of Christ. That certainly follows, if we accept Paul's statement, that divisions in the church are all for the sake of Christ, and have no rights aside from that.

But we must not spend all our time and thought on the church at large. There is much of inspiration and teaching for each of us in the way Paul throws open these doors into an ever-widening experience of religious thought and faith.

"All things are yours," he says; all things belong to you, and come to you to enrich your free, unlimited, developing life. He particularly specifies all phases of Christian thought, "Paul, Apollos, Cephas." Foolish Christian, in Corinth, or in New York, to be saying, "*I* am of Paul," and "*I* am of Peter." You ought to turn it about and say, "I belong neither to Paul nor to Peter but both Paul and Peter belong to me."

There is something fine and helpful in specific loyalties. But there is a danger in them also. We are so apt to be restricted by our loyalties, rather than set free by

them. We need, at times, to take to heart the full, broad message, "all things are yours." Not only church things belong to the Christian, but outside things also; "The world, and life, and death, and things present and things to come; all are yours." I am so apt to stand here in my own place and time and lot, and to say, "I belong to the Presbyterian, or Methodist, or Episcopal church, and to the United States of America, and to the twentieth century, and to the Anglo Saxon race." It is all true, and it is all fine; but the danger is that every time I say, "I belong to this, or to that," I shall be cutting myself off from other goods, restricting my sympathies and my soul-life; that each label shall set me apart and limit my experience. Once in a while I need to turn about and say boldly in the spirit of Paul: "I belong to the Presbyterian Church? Yes, in a sense, but in a higher sense the Presbyterian church belongs to *me*. I have a right to all the good of it, and to all that is good in every other branch of the church. I belong to the twentieth century? Yes, but the twentieth century belongs to me, and so does the nineteenth, and the eighteenth, and all the centuries back to the glory of the first. I belong to the United States? Yes, but the United States of America is *mine*, and so are the other nations of this varied world. I belong to the Anglo Saxon race? Yes, but not in such a fashion as to be tied and hampered by its traditions. The Anglo Saxon inheritance belongs to me, and so does the glory of every human strain, the European and the Oriental. All these divisions of human religion, and thought, and feeling, belong to me, to enrich my life, to set me free, to give me sympathy with universal humanity. All these are *mine*."

It is wonderful to realize that truly to be a Christian means not to be tied up, but to be turned loose; not to

be bound to a single narrow set of traditions, but to be thrilled through and through with a spirit that sends one into the widest and biggest life with confidence and eager joy. To join a church that is truly Christian is to broaden one's life, not to restrict its range. To come to Christ is not to be tied down or shut in, but to follow one who came "that they might have life, and have it abundantly." The Christian spirit is, in the best sense of the words, catholic and cosmopolitan.

"All things are yours." That means that, from the Christian point of view, things, and thoughts, and all the richness of the world, have their reason and end in personality, in developing and enriching souls. The trouble about money, and culture, and other world-prizes and interests, is that they so readily own the man, instead of being owned by him. You know men, as I do, as to whom the proper question would be, not, How much money does he possess? but, How much money possesses him? The man belongs to his business.

But when a man is rightly a Christian, he sees that his business and all other *things* belong to *him,* and have their worth solely in what they may do to enrich and ennoble and set free his personal life and the personal life of other men and women. *Things* are in order to *persons;* that is a fundamental principle of Christianity. The value of *things, thoughts,* possessions, creeds, forms, all externals, lies in what they may mean to *personalities.* "All things are yours."

"And ye are Christ's." There is the second great step, the bigger unity and use. It is not enough to see that *things* are in order to *persons,* that all the riches of the world are to serve and enfranchise you. If your personality is poor and mean, selfish and narrow, if you

cannot see beyond a petty round of individual interests, the *things* that become *yours* are lost to the world and to God. You must add the conviction, "I am Christ's." My life finds its aim and end, its justification for all that is spent on it, all that enriches it and ministers to it, in absolute devotion to the work and will of Christ. All things are mine in order that I may make them all Christ's. A Christian is a sort of commutator, designed for taking worldly things and facts and transmuting them into Christian facts and forces. Money, that was religiously valueless, passes through the hands of a Christian and becomes a part of Christ's power in the world. Thoughts that were unrelated to God pass through the Christian's mind and become messengers of the Christian Gospel. As the food and the books and the friends and the incidents that made up the daily life of Abraham Lincoln were transmuted by his personality into instruments of the national welfare, so the Christian lifts up all the parts and powers and incidents of his life and impresses them into the service of Christ.

Even wider and more daring is the sweep of Paul's thought. "And Christ is God's." Even Christ is not for Himself alone. He finds His value, His real worth, in what He does to make men know God. Even our loyalty to Christ, high, inclusive, all-absorbing as it is and should be, comes not to restrict us, not to blind us to all the goodness and truth and godliness that lie outside the present reach of conscious Christianity. Supreme even above the knowledge of Christ is the knowledge of God. Greater even than the unity of Christians is the unity of believers in God. Christianity enters into human life, becomes a factor in the world, not in order

to set off some godly men from others, not to make a new division, but to help all men in their infinitely varied search after God. Fence-building is poor business for a Christian. True Christianity reaches out and claims all sincere striving after God, all pure aspiration after holiness, all true praying, all forms of faith in God, as a part of itself. It says to the worshippers at every shrine what its representative said in Athens, "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, Him declare I unto you." True Christianity goes to men of other faiths, not to say, "Let us give you the true God in place of your false gods," but, "Let us show you, in Christ, what your God really is."

So rise before us the mighty ascending levels of Christian thought and experience, as this apostle sees and declares them. *Things* and thoughts and forms are of value and worth because they help and enrich and develop *you; you* are of value and worth because you can serve *Christ.* And *Christ* is of worth and value because He can help men find and know *God.*

What would it not mean to God and to man if everywhere that was what Christianity meant, if that were its dominant and pervasive spirit! O that Christ Who cleansed the temple would cast out all our pettiness and exclusiveness, all our satisfaction with little personal and denominational views and practices, and lead the whole church out and up through the bigger unities to the greatest of all, the supreme worth of a simple faith in God.

Some months ago it was my great privilege to be present when a group of Presbyterians, workers in Christ's cause, met to honor a Jew for his noble services to his country and to humanity as United States am-

bassador to Turkey. He told many thrilling and impressive incidents. But the one which impressed most deeply the minds and hearts of us all was the story of his visit to the tomb of Abraham in the ancient city of Hebron. In the party were Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans. As they reached the entrance to the tomb, one of the Christians proposed that they spend ten minutes there in silent prayer to the one God in Whom they all believed. I could well understand the narrator when he said that those few moments of united silent prayer formed the most deeply impressive religious experience in his life. They were all conscious of standing in the presence of the deepest and most profound of realities, a common faith in God so great that it lifted them for the moment out of their differences into a real unity of heart and mind.

We know well that Paul does not urge here, nor should we urge, that we abandon our more specific loyalties, and rest content with a faith and thought and practice of religion so large and vague and formless that all men can share it with us. We need the other side of the truth also. There is a temptation, against which we need to be ever on guard, to be content with soft and vague notions of God and of religion, to float in a sea of fluid impressions that has no shore of firm conviction and loyalty; to "sit as God, holding no form of creed, but contemplating all;" to be of the number "Whose faith has center everywhere, nor cares to fix itself to form." There is much of that sort of religion today, as shallow as it is widespreading. To be truly a man of God, one must think, and believe, and stand by his convictions, and identify himself with that part of the Christian church which best fits his personal beliefs and

efforts. It is good not only to believe in God, but to be, positively and intensely, a Christian believer, and a Presbyterian Christian, if one's Christian thought and faith find a home naturally in that branch of the church. What Paul is trying to do is not to loosen our loyalty to our denomination, still less to our Christ; but to get us to see that our denominational loyalty must find its end in the service of Christ, and that our Christian loyalty must find its end in making men know and love God.

It is time the whole Christian church were getting into the control of that broad, generous, outreaching spirit. In the face of the hatreds and divisions, the local patriotisms and offensive nationalisms, which dishonor our day, it is a crime for Christians to care for any but the biggest and broadest and most essential interests of man's spiritual life. Our loyalty to Christ does not shut us off from common humanity; it sets us to seeking points of agreement, claiming possibilities of fellowship, ever remembering that the bigger, broader unities are those that are worth most. That is our birthright as Christians. For Christ came not to judge, but to save; not to destroy, but to fulfil; not to frown upon and repress men's varying and instinctive gropings after God, but to enlighten and enrich them; not to divide the temple of God the Father into many little, separate shrines, but to rend the veils, and break down the middle walls of partition, and set us all in the one great, common temple of God the Father of all men. It is our solemn duty and our high privilege, as followers of Him, to see that the lower loyalties do not shut us out from the higher, but that all that is precious to us shall be set to the service of Christ, that through Christ all

men may come to the Father, and "there may be one flock, one shepherd." It is a motto for every church, for every minister, for every Christian:—"Wherefore let no man glory in men. For all things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."

William Pierson Merrill.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHURCH DIVISIONS AND CHRISTIANITY. By William Leighton Grane, Prebendary of Chichester, Author of "Hard Sayings of Jesus Christ," "The Passing of War," etc. London: Macmillan and Co. 296 pages. $2.00 net.

Most of the failures of Christianity are due to its divisive spirit. If we were not so accustomed to churches' opposing and hating each other, which has stupefied our reason, the amazing spectacle would horrify us more than armies slaughtering each other on the field of battle. The urgency of this condition has called forth this remarkable book of nine chapters by the Prebendary of Chichester, England, who argues with reverence and boldness for "a re-baptism into a new sense of God," making repentance on the part of the whole church the one door of our hope. It is a most engaging volume and its message is most timely.

Its background is the great world war, in which the churches are so hopelessly entangled, apparently denying "the thesis that the personality and the principles of Jesus Christ provide the world with a unifying power competent to appease its antagonisms and assuage its unrest." The modern churches have departed from the most fundamental principle of Christianity in not thinking in terms of peace. It was the practice of the early Church and it is not an unfair inference to trace our modern day failures, "not to any defect in the principles and spirit of Christ's religion, but to faults in their embodiment and in the organization entrusted with the stewardship of their influence." The early Church had a unity of fellowship; the modern churches have as many hostile divisions as there were individual Christians in Jerusalem at the time of the ascension of Jesus. These days are a challenge driving us back to the primitive ideals, thereby saturating ourselves with the idea of unity. It is only in this way that we can hope to generate the passionate enthusiasm needed to cope with the overwhelming obstacles. Whatever change is coming in a generation must be preceded by a change of ideals. One of the most fundamental changes must come in the realm of Church polity, which is one of the chief hindrances to unity, having always steered us away from reunion.

The great schism of the eleventh century, dividing the Church in the East from that in the West, left us the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic churches. These have moved further apart with the years, although there was no sound reason for separation on doctrinal grounds up to July 18, 1870, when the Vatican decrees foisted on the Roman Catholic church three

new articles of belief, namely, the immaculate conception (promulgated first in 1854), the universal episcopacy of the Pope and his infallibility *in rebus divinis*. This widened the chasm, making it "almost immeasurable," as expressed by one of the unprogressive prelates of the Greek Orthodox church forty-three years afterwards. Another illiberal specimen of the Eastern dignitaries goes on to affirm, "We are Orthodox, and there is nothing for others to do but to become Orthodox also." With no less stubbornness a Roman Catholic writer in *The Dublin Review*, said, "The Church's call, whether to individuals or communities, is a summons not to treat, but to surrender. She sits as a judge in her own controversy; and the only plea she admits is a *Confiteor*, the only prayer she listens to a *Miserere*." Surely Rehoboam is again ruling on the bare *dicta* of authority.

Another chasm came in the Reformed movement of the sixteenth century with its prolific facilities for fresh divisions. The Latin and Greek, Anglican and Protestant are evidently guilty—though not in the same degree. "Every organization has merited the scorn of the world by appearing competitive instead of coöperative." The relative ascendency of these great divisions, covering a period of two centuries—1700 to 1900—present interesting figures. In 1700 the Greek church adherents stood 33 millions; in 1900, 128 millions. In 1700 the Roman Catholic claimed 90 millions; in 1900, 242 millions. In 1700 the Protestant faith claimed 32 millions; in 1900, 520 millions. The increase of the Greek church was four times (33—128), the Roman church three times (90—242), and the Protestant faith sixteen times (32—520).

The bringing of these into the unity of fellowship is the task. In the correct belief that we are approaching the stage of history which recognizes the basis of all reality as spiritual, Mr. Grane rightly sees hope. The philosophy of the future will be the philosophy of the spirit, as the faith of the future will be found in the religion of the spirit. Psychology is superseding both scholasticism and biology. Perhaps matter itself is a spiritual thing. The need is not more intellect nor power, but "the spirit to use capacity aright," sharing the conviction of Paul that "the mind of the spirit is life and peace." No finer sentence is framed by the author than when he says, "The church that seeks authority for itself can never win the world; but no church which clearly and truly testifies to Christ will ever lack authority. The Church is not above her Lord. The words which state His own claim to be believed must *a fortiori* describe the genuine authority of the Church: 'He that speaketh from himself,' said Christ, 'seeketh his own glory; but he that seeketh the glory of Him that sent him, the same is true.' Not till the Church assimilates that lesson will she ever convince the world that her teaching is of God."

As difficult as the task is, the Christian conscience must not accept the disunion of Christendom as past healing. God relies on the moral sense and the free-will of man to cast off such a fallacy and these steps are the probable way-marks to a possible path of recovery: (1) willingness on the part of all organized Christendom to acknowledge error, (2) a new understanding of and regard for the most fundamental verities, and (3) a much more absolute allegiance to the supremacy of Christ. It is impossible for Christendom to have failed without some serious departure from the teaching and intention of Christ. Hence every church concerned in the unity of Christendom must pass through the gateway of humility and penitence, as expressed in the words of that pious Roman Catholic theologian Johann Adam Möhler, when he said, "We have all erred, we have all sinned; and it is the open confession of a common guilt, which will be followed by the Festival of Reconciliation."

We need to return to the simplicity of the early Church, putting first things first and making Christ the one rallying point for a united and efficacious Christendom. Piecemeal efforts for unity promise to be the first satisfactory steps. Since Anglican orders are doubted by the Greeks and denied by the Latin church, and the Anglican church is shy of the Reformed churches, Mr. Grane pointedly says, "But if in such an enterprise the Anglican church is to bear a part in keeping with her best traditions, I submit that she must make up her mind afresh, and show her hand anew, in favor of the freedom of the Spirit as against the bondage of the letter. We cannot take our part by merely facing both ways, moving nowhere, and doing nothing but drift on the Dead Sea of isolation. On what principle of fundamental Christianity ought we to remain blind and deaf to the voices and activities now so clear and manifest in those quarters where a genuine desire for reunion undoubtedly exists? Has the National Church of England no mission to support, encourage, and—as far as ever it can be found possible—*meet* this widespread movement of thought? Throughout the whole of the now far larger part of Christendom which refused to repudiate the Reformation this leaven is busily at work. If we remain impassive, we shall certainly incur the old reproach: 'How is it that you cannot interpret this time?'"

Throughout Protestant Christendom there are unmistakable signs of an active unifying spirit with gratifying results. Both Greek and Latin dignitaries have pointed out that the consolidation of Protestant churches would aid rather than delay this fellowship with the rest of Christendom. The ground is being cleared for a United Free Church in England and there is likelihood of the United Free Church in Scotland becoming a part of the Established Church of Scotland. In the foreign field the same note is being struck, looking for a more united presentment of Christianity, if the

faith is to prevail. Organized Christianity has never faced such a crisis since the sixteenth century. It is a growing conviction that the corporate systems, which fail to infect the world with a higher spirit than the world can produce, fail together. The teachings of the Church are fast ceasing to exert a living influence. Until the authority of Christ is allowed the place assigned it in the New Testament, the Church will never silence nor satisfy the human cry, which rises out of a genuine sense of loss: "Back to Jesus Himself; to His sublime morality of the Spirit, applicable to all ages, and true to all time." Neither uniformity nor exclusion can possibly succeed, but unity and comprehension will. Priest and prophet must be recognized as counterparts in an ideal completeness. Our hope hangs on repentance, whose essence is the *change of mind*, whereby we forsake wrong courses and follow right ones. Nothing short of a revolution of thought can bring this, but it must come, for God is Light and God is Love. The Prebendary of Chichester sees clearly and has spoken with the boldness of a prophet.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM ANALYZED. A DISPASSIONATE EXAMINATION OF ROMISH CLAIMS. By J. A. Phillips, Missionary of the Methodist Episcopal Church (South) in Mexico. Introduction by William Burt, D.D., LL.D., one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 310 pages. $1.50 net.

One of the difficult things to-day is to look with fairness on the religious views of another. It has been more difficult to do this in the past than now. In many instances Protestants are looking with fairness upon the positions of their fellow Protestants, and it is not infrequent that we find the same thing true between Protestants and Roman Catholics. As we get to know each other we will be fair in judging each other. So long as we live in isolation from each other we will not be able to have a clear understanding of each other. That there are differences between various bodies of Christians cannot be denied, but in many instances these differences are secondary and sometimes superficial. In the instance of differences between the Roman Catholics and the Protestants there are some fundamental principles upon which the two bodies differ, but as fundamental as these differences are and as wide as these differences appear to be, we deny to each other our faith in Christ, if there is no basis of agreement. As to how to find that in this day we must acknowledge great difficulties, but when we meet together as brothers the difficulties will not be as great as when we stay apart as enemies. The author of this book has brought, without malice or desire of offense, much data from Roman Catholic sources along with his own experience as a missionary in Mexico. He concedes many points to the credit of Rome, but boldly attacks other points. There

are issues which we cannot cover, but whether we agree with the author or not, certainly his analysis and conclusion provoke the keenest thought. We cannot help wishing that the time would come when in the atmosphere of prayer and fairness on both sides the wrongs of the whole Church could be set right at the feet of Him Who died for us all. This cannot come in the heat of controversy, but there are questions regarding certain conditions that only those who are involved can answer. And the day is at hand when these answers should express themselves in such corrections of present conditions as would make them to some degree satisfactory to those who so persistently ask the questions. The Spirit of Jesus Christ must fill the hearts of all believers before there can be a united Church, which is so necessary for the healing of the world's sore.

THE MAN IN THE STREET AND RELIGION. By Burris A. Jenkins. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 248 pages. $1.25 net.

This book is a brief résumé of the popular thought of these times. The ten chapters sparkle with living messages. The author is the pastor of a large church in Kansas City and he knows how to reach men. These messages tell the story of his ministry. In Sherwood Eddy's endorsement of this book he says: "Among the three hundred millions of India, who constitute one-fifth of the human race, I never found an atheist nor a man who needed any outward proof of the existence of God. Among the four hundred millions of China and the Far East, I found a deep hunger for God, for the real, the spiritual and the unseen. The same was true among the warm-hearted students in the snows of Russia, even in the midst of agnosticism and immorality. In the war zone, despite the terrible outbreaking of human passions and of doubts raised by the war, men about to face death in the trenches longed to find God. They were earnest, reverent, open-hearted, hungry. Dr. Jenkins shows that in our own land, on the crowded street or the lonely prairie, men are deeply and truly religious. May this book help them to find the reality which they unconsciously crave."

THE TRAIL TO THE HEARTS OF MEN. A STORY OF EAST AND WEST. By Abe Cory. Illustrated. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 332 pages. $1.35 net.

Those who know the author of this fascinating story will know at the outset that it is thoroughly worth while. Paul Redmond's experiences in China are not only full of interest, gripping the attention as the story moves quickly from one scene to another, but their greatest charm lies in the challenging results of the story. A man must follow the path at the end of which is the vision of life's accomplishment. Difficulties in

attaining to that end are secondary. All things must go down before him who treads the way in pioneer paths for the good of others. It is a beautiful story and will be treasured by many as one of the finest contributions made by one of the foremost missionaries of our day.

THE JEWS IN THE EASTERN WAR ZONE. New York: The American Jewish Committee. 120 pages.

THE Jew is always interesting, whether we read of him in the days of David and Nehemiah, or driven from Spain in the fifteenth century, or suffering hardships in Russia in recent years. This little book contains much information not heretofore published in the United States. It is a message from the silent millions of wronged people. It is an appeal for sympathy to the conscience of the world in the cause of justice. No one can read it without pausing to think. Perhaps the conditions will be bettered since the revolution in Russia, but the story of injustice to the Jew is so long and so sad that we cannot help asking, How long before this injustice will be removed? It is not simply a Jewish or Russian question. It is a world question and calls for the sympathy of mankind.

PAUL THE APOSTLE. PIONEER MISSIONARY TO THE HEATHEN WORLD. By JOHN W. LIGON. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 240 pages. $1.00 net.

ALTHOUGH many have written books on the life of Paul and his missionary tours, this book will be read with interest, not only because interest never lags in the fascinating personality of the Apostle to the Gentiles, but because it is a practical rather than a critical study of the Book of Acts, being a kind of running commentary. The first chapter deals with Paul's early years, the second with the founding of the Church, then the death of Stephen and Paul's conversion. The fifth chapter tells of the events in Antioch, and follows in interesting detail with the account of the three missionary tours, closing with his experiences in Jerusalem and Caesarea, his second arrest and his farewell letter to Timothy. The events and instances of Paul's career are woven into such a continuous narrative as to make the book a living picture of his remarkable life. It is beautifully written, conservative in theology and preëminently adapted to mission study classes.

CB

VOL. VII No. II

"The greatest need of our generation is that of apostles of reconciliation."—JOHN R. MOTT.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Edited by PETER AINSLIE

IF YOU find something that is pushing you away from your fellow Christians, do not deceive yourself by thinking that that something is religion. It is religion that builds up brotherhood; it is the opposite that destroys it. Hence practicing friendship with all who love our Lord as if your life depended on it is the most vital witness you can give concerning the evidences of Christianity.

OCTOBER, 1917

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY
Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

AGENTS:
Christian Board of Publication, ST. LOUIS
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, LONDON, E. C. 4.
Maruzen Company, Ltd., TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO, FUKUOKA and SENDAI

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE
CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Peace in the Divided Church of Christ. It is issued in January, April, July and October.

Edited by PETER AINSLIE

Vol. VII. OCTOBER, 1917 No. 2

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:
IDEALS FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY 9

THE MOVEMENT TOWARDS UNITY IN THE ENGLISH FREE CHURCHES. F. B. MEYER 13

AMERICA'S ORIENTAL PROBLEM FROM THE CHRISTIAN POINT OF VIEW. SIDNEY L. GULICK 26

ESSENTIALS TO CHRISTIAN UNION. F. M. RAINS 37

NEXT STEPS IN COMMUNITY RELIGION. JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 49

"THAT THEY MAY ALL BE ONE." ALEXANDER WHYTE 59

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 69

BOOK REVIEWS 77

THIS JOURNAL IS PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY and is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its readers are in all communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Prof. A. R. MacEwen, 5 Doune Terrace, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Frederick Courtney, office, 143 E. 37th St., New York. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Sir Richard Stapley; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson, Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North, Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford, Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

SWANWICK FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, 17 Palace Road, Crouch End, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity

Inc.

(Having its Inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell a Presbyterian Minister of Washington, Pa., 1809)

An Organization of Disciples of Christ

PURPOSE OF THE ASSOCIATION: To watch for every indication of Christian unity and to hasten the time, by intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith."

Ινα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, πάτήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.

Ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu Pater in me, et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint, ut credat mundus, quia tu me misisti.

That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.

CONDITION OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE ASSOCIATION: Sympathy with the work of Christian unity, expressed in prayer and coöperation, irrespective of church affiliation, and the payment of not less than $2.00 for annual membership fee, payment preferably in January. Those paying less are counted contributors, but not members.

COMMISSIONERS: Peter Ainslie, D.D., LL.D., President, Baltimore, Md.; Carey E. Morgan, M.A., Vice-President, Nashville, Tenn.; F. D. Kershner, M.A., LL.D., Secretary, Cincinnati, Ohio; H. C. Armstrong, M.A., B.D., Baltimore, Md.; E. B. Bagby, M.A., B.D., Washington, D. C.; F. W. Burnham, LL.D., Cincinnati, Ohio; I. S. Chenoweth, M.A., Philadelphia, Pa.; Finis S. Idleman, D.D., New York, N. Y.; Z. T. Sweeney, LL.D., Columbus, Ind.; B. A. Abbott, B.A., St. Louis, Mo.; H. M. Bell, M.A., LL.D., Des Moines, Ia.; E. M. Bowman, Esq., Chicago, Ill.; C. M. Chilton, D.D., St. Joseph, Mo.; J. H. Garrison, M.A., LL.D., St. Louis, Mo.; J. H. Goldner, B.A., Cleveland, Ohio; F. A. Henry, M.A., LL.B., Cleveland, Ohio; T. C. Howe, Ph.D., Indianapolis, Ind.; W. P. Lipscomb, Esq., Washington, D. C.; R. A. Long, Esq., Kansas City, Mo.; Eli H. Long, M.D., Buffalo, N. Y.; C. S. Medbury, D.D., Des Moines, Ia.; C. C. Morrison, B.A., Chicago, Ill.; A. B. Philputt, D.D., LL.D., Indianapolis, Ind.; E. L. Powell, LL.D., Louisville, Ky.; W. F. Richardson, M.A., LL.D., Los Angeles, Calif.; I. J. Spencer, M.A., LL.D., Lexington, Ky.

WORK OF THE ASSOCIATION: The Commission of the Association is simply the Executive Committee of twenty-five members, nine of whom are the Committee on Direction, dealing with such problems as may come before the Association for action between the annual meetings. It is proposed to use this Commission under four divisions: namely, Commission on Christian Unity, dealing with Christian unity in general; Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order; Commission on Federation; and Commission on International Friendship. To all these subjects the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity has spoken. The Association publishes The Christian Union Quarterly.

For further particulars, address

Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity

PETER AINSLIE, President

Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

Bibliography of Christian Unity

THE BOOKS included in this list are by Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Congregationalists, Unitarians, Lutherans, Disciples of Christ, etc.

CHRISTIAN UNION, Van Dyke, Appleton, 1885 ..... $1.00
CHRISTIAN UNION, Garrison, St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1906 ..... 1.00
CHRISTIAN UNION IN EFFORT, Firth, Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1911.. 1.50
CHRISTIAN UNITY, Briggs, Scribner, 1900 ..... 1.00
CHRISTIAN UNITY AT WORK, Macfarland, Federal Council 1.00
CHURCH DIVISIONS AND CHRISTIANITY, Grane, Macmillan, 1916.... 2.00
HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS ADVOCATING CHRISTIAN UNION, Young, Chicago, The Christian Century Co., 1904 ..... 1.00
HOW TO PROMOTE CHRISTIAN UNION, Kershner, Cincinnati, The Standard Publishing Co., 1916 ..... 1.00
LECTURES ON THE REUNION OF THE CHURCH, Döllinger, Dodd, 1872 1.50
OUR PLEA FOR UNION AND THE PRESENT CRISIS, Willett, Chicago, Christian Century Co. ..... .50
PASSING PROTESTANTISM AND COMING CATHOLICISM, Smyth, Scribner, 1908 ..... 1.00
RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD, London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1908 .....
RESTATEMENT AND REUNION, Streeter, Macmillan, 1914 ..... .75
SOME THOUGHTS OF CHRISTIAN REUNION, Carpenter, Macmillan, 1895 ..... 1.25
SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF UNITY IN CHRISTENDOM, Tarner, London, Elliott Stock, 1895 .....
THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, Wells, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905.... .75
THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, Whyte, Armstrong, 1907 ..... .25
THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, Campbell, St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1890 ..... 1.00
THE CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS UNITY, Kelly, Longmans, 1913..... 1.50
THE CHURCHES OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL, Macfarland, Revell.... 1.00
THE LARGER CHURCH, Lanier, Fredericksburg, Va. 1.25
THE LEVEL PLAN FOR CHURCH UNION, Brown, Whittaker, 1910..... 1.50
THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Cobb, Crowell, 1915..... 1.25
THE MESSAGE OF THE DISCIPLES FOR THE UNION OF THE CHURCH, Ainslie, Revell, 1913 ..... 1.00
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS SECTS, McComas, Revell, 1912.... 1.25
THE SEVENFOLD UNITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Hall, Longmans, 1911 ..... .75
THE UNITED CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES, Shields, Scribner, 1895 ..... 2.50
THOUGHTS OF THE PRESENT POSITION OF PROTESTANTISM, Harnack, Macmillan, 1899 ..... 1.00
UNITY AND MISSIONS, Brown, Revell, 1915..... 1.50
WHAT MUST THE CHURCH DO TO BE SAVED? Simms, Revell, 1913.. 1.50

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

A WORLD Conference on Faith and Order, time and place not yet named.

AT THE instance of the Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order of the Protestant Episcopal Church, request is made that all who have been baptized into the name of Christ observe the eight days beginning January 18th through the 25th, 1918 (January 5th-12th in the calendar of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Churches) as a season for special prayer for the reunion of Christendom and for the blessing and the guidance of all efforts to that end, including especially the attempt to be made in the World Conference on Faith and Order to bring Christians to such an understanding and appreciation of each other that the way may be opened for increased effort in the way of constructive work for reunion.

AT THE instance of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Pentecost Sunday has been named primarily as the day for special sermons on Christian unity in all churches, along with prayers to that end.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

F. B. MEYER,

Bachelor of Arts and Doctor of Divinity, has been one of the most active spirits in the British Federation of Free Churches, having served as president of the Federation in 1904 and later as secretary. He also served as president of the Baptist Union, and is well known in London as the minister of Christ Church, Westminster Road. His name has been made familiar on both sides of the Atlantic both by his public addresses and his books. Some of his books are: *A Prince With God, Reveries and Realities,* etc.

SIDNEY L. GULICK,

Bachelor of Arts and Doctor of Divinity, was professor of theology at Doshisha, Kyoto, and lecturer in the Japanese Imperial University at Kyoto. He has been active in problems dealing with international relations, especially between America and the Orient. He is the associate secretary of the commission of peace and arbitration of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America and secretary of the American Branch of the World Alliance of the Churches for the Promotion of International Friendship. He is the author of *The White Peril in the Far East, The American-Japanese Problem, Fight for Peace,* etc.

F. M. RAINS,

Doctor of Laws, was first a minister in Kentucky, then in Kansas, where he became secretary of the State Missionary Society, later secretary of the Church Extension Fund, and since 1893 he has been secretary of the Foreign Christian Missionary Society of Cincinnati, Ohio, in the service of which he has raised many millions of dollars for foreign missions. He has dedicated nearly seven hundred churches, and his voice has been heard in every part of the country pleading for larger missionary activities.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE

was educated at Park College, Mo., and received his theological training at Union, Auburn and Princeton, receiving the degree of Bachelor of Divinity from the latter in 1906, when he became associate secretary of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. In 1914 he became secretary. He is active in both denominational and interdenominational work, serving on several boards and various committees. He is the author of *Missions Striking Home, World Missions from the Home Base,* etc.

ALEXANDER WHYTE,

Doctor of Divinity and Doctor of Laws, is the principal of New College, Edinburgh, and the senior minister of St. George's United Free Church. He was tendered the freedom of the city of Edinburgh in 1909 and no man more fully deserved the honor. He has been a voluminous writer through his seventy-eight years and he is one of the most commanding personalities in church circles in Scotland. Some of his books are: *Characters and Characteristics of William Law, Bunyan's Characters,* Volumes I-IV, *Thomas Shepard,* etc.

A PRAYER FOR UNITY

Our Father, Thou art the Friend of us all and the costliness of Thy Church is a perpetual reminder to us of the immortality of Thy love. When the days were dark in that long history since Jesus was on earth, some of our brothers lost the vision of Thyself, and Thy word was sometimes forgotten in the bitterness of strife, but as we strive to get back to Thy sacred ideals of a holy and united Church, we ask that Thou wouldst check the first rising of sectarianism and unbrotherliness in our thoughts and hold us true to Thy Word, that Thy Spirit be no longer grieved. Make us long-suffering and charitable to those who differ with us and kind and gentle to all, especially to those who love us not. Show us the path—Thy path, for we would walk in no other, and may we take no step other than that which is ordered of Thee and go nowhere except Thou go with us, for the sake of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE NEED OF AWAKENING TO OUR ERRORS

A CENTURY ago we were all eyes for the errors of every religious body but our own; to-day we are recognizing the truth in one another's positions; but there is one more stage, and that is for each to awaken to the *errors* in his *own* views—and that is the hardest stage of all. "As the Church of *Jerusalem, Alexandria,* and *Antioch* have erred," says the XIXth Article, with admirable complacency, "so also the Church of *Rome* hath erred, not only in their living and manner of Ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith." And is it likely that the Church of England is wholly right, that the Presbyterians have made no mistake, that the Congregationalists have avoided every error? No. Different religious bodies stand for different aspects of the truth, but they also stand for different aspects of error. Get rid of the errors, and the different aspects of truth will fit into one another like the different parts of a picture puzzle. The magnitude of truth, no doubt, is such that it is impossible for any one man, or perhaps even for any one community, to grasp it whole; but this is not what keeps us apart; at bottom what separates us is our manifold misconception of truth. Men say it is their principles that keep them apart; they forget the possibility that principles may need revision.

—BURNETT HILLMAN STREETER, *Oxford, England.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Vol. VII. OCTOBER, 1917 No. 2

EDITORIAL

IDEALS FOR CHRISTIAN UNITY

Before any marked changes can come for the unity of Christendom there must come a change of ideals. It is not enough for a few here and there to possess these ideals, but the ideals for Christian unity must become the ideals of the masses before this problem can so much as approach a solution. For several centuries the thinking tools of the Church have been forged in the workshops of division, and consequently adapted to divisive conditions. The time has come when we need a new set of thinking tools and these must be adapted to a united Church. We must learn to think in the terms of unity.

There is no longer a likelihood of the rise of any great divisions in Christendom, such as characterized the past centuries. The tendency now is rather toward the unifying of many of these divisions that belong to one family, such as the various branches of the Methodist Church into one body, the Presbyterian divisions into one body, and so forth. We are looking for unity to come by piecemeal, a union of local churches, a union of smaller bodies, a union of missionary effort, and a dozen

ways that heretofore have been blocked are now open for advance into such coöperation as must eventually culminate in union. Certainly we would not want to think that the various denominations are to continue without diverting to the right or to the left, with all their denominational machinery, denominational schools, denominational press, and denominational boards of all sorts, each contending as though it were the only expression of Christianity in the world. If this condition is continued through the next century as it has in the past century, then God pity us and save us from a world catastrophe, to which the present war shall be but a nursery game.

Nothing is so significant in the present war as a reminder to all Christians of the weakness of the Church. Had the Church been united and lived up to the standard of her Lord, this war could never have been. As it is, the Church can hardly be found on the map of the world. It is of no more consequence in chastening the wrongdoers and bringing peace than if it did not exist. The Pope's proposals, with all the prestige of his great office, passed with little more than a polite bow, really creating no more interest than if it had come from the Sultan as the spokesman of the Mohammedan religion. What a plight the whole church is in, some stumbling into one alley, some into another, but no great voice calling the nations to judgment other than the booming of cannon and the charge of musketry! Once Jesus said that the rocks would cry out if there were no human voices. Is that the meaning of these times? Certainly the condition of today challenges us to sober thinking.

Whatever service the various denominations may have rendered in the past in their contention for certain truth or truths—and no one of them is without credit—

yet those are now largely antequated issues, either established, proving the justice of their contention; or modified to a larger adjustment, indicating the need of restatement. But the issue facing us to-day is of a different character than that that faced our forebears. It is dealing (1) with Christianity as a whole—no longer in parts, (2) with a spirituality based upon righteousness—no longer tied up with definition, and (3) with combating the gigantic forces of evil, which we are beginning to see can be met only by a united Church.

New mental routes, which were absolutely unknown a few years ago, are being followed by the scientists to the rejection of the old. Has this no suggestion for us, who are students of religious problems? Is it not true that old methods in every other department of thought are giving way to the new? Our ideals for unity must lead us out of the rubbish and slavery of sectarianism until we shall think in the terms of a united Christendom. We are in the laboratory period, and to find results we must use the laboratory methods. Experiments such as that at Kikuyu in 1913 must be multiplied. To get away from what we are to what we ought to be is the task before us, and the transfer will not be easy or without protests. The World Conference on Faith and Order has in it much hope. The preparatory steps are being taken with commendatory caution. In this preparatory period an opportunity is furnished for a practical survey of the field, the awakening of interest and quickening of the ideals for unity. Of the conference itself, whenever and wherever it may be held, are matters of uncertainty, but when it is held, the benefits must exceed those of any conference ever held in the history of the Church, for there has never been held in the Church a conference on unity that has the unselfish and sympathetic interest of

so many Christians. As said an American bishop, "We will go in this conference as Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Baptists, Methodists, Disciples and so forth, but only God knows how we will come out." All the thinking relative to the World Conference is a definite contribution to our ideals for unity.

That there are difficulties in the way is no question. It would not be a problem if there were no difficulties. Neither would the challenge be in proportion to the greatness of man if the difficulties were not great, but great as they are, they are not impossible. They will not be removed by criticizing history, trying to prove that one side is right and the other is wrong; nor by setting up a standard, calling all to come over to us and excluding those who do not see as we do. There must be patience, toleration, humility, penitence, prayer and love. No ecclesiasticism can express the spirit of Christ, but these principles do. They are to be studied afresh until we discover the elements contained in them. Then our respective denominations will minimize in our eyes, our thought regarding others will rephrase itself, our aloftness will be the evidence of our pride, and our present barriers will reveal both our superficiality and iniquity, while Christ will become more and more to us in personal conquest and the infilling of His Spirit, so that our witness for Him will be augmented in power. This condition lies somewhere in the future—said the apostle, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." The quickening of our ideals for unity will hasten the day.

THE MOVEMENT TOWARDS UNITY IN THE ENGLISH FREE CHURCHES

By F. B. MEYER, B.A., Minister Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road, London.

To EXPLORE the whole of the causes that have conduced to the present unity, which exists among the Free Churches of England, would involve a much more detailed historical survey than is possible within the present limits. But it is unquestionable that the necessity of maintaining their existence in face of the Established Church and the pressure of the Church, has exerted a very considerable influence in that direction; and was probably much more operative and apparent in the past than to-day.

It has been claimed, not without reason, that Wycliff was a Free Churchman before the Free Church movement assumed definite form and shape. He maintained a threefold witness: that the Bible is the ultimate court of appeal, that each individual Christian may exercise his private judgment on the most cherished dogma of the Church, and lastly, but notably for our present purpose, that *when the Church grasps at temporal power* she sacrifices her true authority and jeopardises her influence. To quote his own words: "The pope should surrender all temporal authority to the civil power and advise his clergy to do the same." Those words appeared to be unfruitful for almost two hundred years, but they worked in the hearts of men, struck their roots into good soil, and have yielded harvest on harvest of noble fruit.

It is, of course, necessary, when approaching the head of the waters, to distinguish between the Puritan and the

Sectaries. The Puritans, in the reign of Elizabeth, were a party within the Anglican Church, and their objection to superstitious usages was shared by a large number of the clergy and laity alike; but the Sectaries or Separatists were altogether outside the Church; and were beginning to withdraw from attendance at public worship on the ground that the existence of a national Church was contrary to the Word of God. Puritan and Presbyterian, to quote Green the historian, felt as bitter an abhorrence as Elizabeth herself of "the Brownists," as they were nicknamed, after their founder Robert Brown. Parliament, Puritan as it was, passed a statute against them. Brown was forced to fly to the Netherlands, and many of his followers were driven into exile. It is not difficult to understand the hatred of the archbishop and bishops to these simple-minded folk who rejected ceremonies as relics of idolatry, the rule of bishops as unscriptural, and joined themselves "as the Lord's free people" into "a church estate on the fellowship of the Gospel." They also asserted "their Christian right to walk in all the ways that God had made known or should make known to them."

So rigorous was the persecution that some of these earliest Free Churchmen sought refuge in other lands, found a harbor of refuge in Amsterdam and Leyden, and finally secured everlasting fame as the Pilgrim Fathers of the *Mayflower*. "They knew that they were pilgrims and looked not much on these things, but lifted their eyes to Heaven, their dearest country, and quieted their spirits."

During their residence in Holland, the main body of the exiles, who had not crossed the Atlantic, further developed their ideals and formed independent congregations, each forming in itself a complete church, and to

them the name of Independents was attached. A small section drifted into a still more marked severance from the Established Church, in their belief in the necessity of believers' baptism, and these were designated Baptists. Under the Long Parliament large contingents of these exiles, reinforced by others from America led by Roger Williams and Hugh Peters, returned to England, and Bishop Hall asserts that in London and its suburbs alone there were, in 1641, no fewer than fourscore congregations of sectaries. During the Commonwealth, dissent of various kinds had perfect liberty to organize itself according to its several preferences, though even Cromwell was unable entirely to arrest the persecution, in which the new sect of Quakers was involved.

The Restoration introduced a fresh era into the history of English Nonconformity. For while it narrowed the Church of England, it enlarged Nonconformity by forcing into its ranks 2,500 of the most godly and devoted ministers of the Anglican Church. The Act of Uniformity required that every clergyman of the Established Church should "on some Lord's Day before the Feast of St. Bartholomew make a public declaration of unfeigned consent to all and everything contained and prescribed by the Book of Common Prayer." Refusal to do this *ipso facto* deprived them of their livings. The folly and inhumanity of this enactment were lightly esteemed by Charles and his advisors, intoxicated with arrogance and passion, but they lay heavily on the hearts of the people to whom these devoted men had ministered, and scattered far and wide a detestation of the policy which had silenced men like Howe and Baxter, Joseph Alleine and Stephen Charnock, Thomas Godwin and Joseph Caryl.

These men did not primarily hold the views of the

Quakers, Independents, and Baptists, concerning the connection between Church and State, but as they lay in the same prisons, were haled before the same courts, and were exposed to the same penalties, it is easy to understand how swiftly they would become attempered and fused into a vigorous and invincible unity. This was still further consolidated through the vicissitudes and persecutions that befell the Nonconformists during the three following reigns.

The next outstanding event in the history of English Nonconformity was the great Methodist revival. In the earlier stages Wesley's influence checked certain developments of Methodism as an independent ecclesiastical organization. It was still regarded as supplementary to the Established Church. He ruled that no meetings should be held during the hours of worship at the parish church, and that members of Methodist societies should attend the parish churches to receive the Sacrament. But as Methodism became conscious of its power and opportunity, and as its influence on English life became more accentuated and acknowledged, these restrictions were ignored, and Methodism began to organize itself as a distinct body. Out of that great movement other bodies sprang, breathing its spirit, though introducing modifications in organization.

The effect of the Methodist revival evidenced itself not only in a quickening of the religious life of the Nonconformist churches but in arousing them from the torpor into which they had fallen, when the virulence of persecution had somewhat spent itself. They recovered their ancient spirit, and began to speak with the old accent. Their common struggle for civil and religious liberty still further welded the unity, which common sufferings had engendered. The old timid halting between

two opinions, which had characterized the period of religious declension, gave way to an enthusiastic and general agreement that the whole system of tests and creeds imposed by a civil power was rotten to the core. The ejected ministers of 1662 had acquiesced in a religious establishment and would have defended the theory. A hundred years had passed since then, and Nonconformity was winning its soul, and coming to see and to declare the beauty of the ideal of a Free Church in a Free State. To realize this ideal they had first to assert their rights as English citizens and demand equal treatment before the law.* Speaking for the whole body of English Nonconformity, "the eloquent and impassioned" Robert Robinson exclaimed:—"The English Nonconformists absolutely deny all human authority in matters of religion—they deny it to all civil governments of every form —they think Jesus Christ the sole Head of the Christian Church."

All sections of Nonconformity threw themselves into the fight for the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, and of the Conventicle and Five-Mile Acts, which had never been expunged from the statute-book. In the battle against Church-rates, in the demand for admittance to the universities, in the alteration of the unjust Burial laws, Nonconformists stood together. It took twenty-five years to abolish the compulsory Church-rate, but the long delay was an immeasurable benefit. As their great leader, John Bright, put it, it taught them to distrust compromises and demand complete justice. They unanimously refused to recognize the rights of the Established Church and support it by rate-aid. This common effort created a new sense of kinship among the Free Churches.

*This is fully treated by Rev. C. Silvester Horne, in his Popular History of the Free Churches.

Methodism took a conspicuous part in the great crusade; and in 1868 the Established Church had to abandon her right to extract support from those, who stood outside her pale. It is not necessary again to emphasize the effect of all these common struggles and efforts in securing a further approximation between the various sections of English Nonconformity. They were already one in their beliefs, and in the assertion of their freedom from State-support and State-control. Each had developed on its own distinctive lines, each had laid special emphasis on some aspect of doctrine or organization, which had been in danger of being obscured or forgotten; but all were agreed on the fundamental positions which should be maintained as their common heritage and their common witness to their age.

Precisely at this moment the Tractarian movement, led by Newman, Pusey, and others broke upon England, advocating the doctrines and practises of mediæval Catholicism, and threatening a revival of those features in the Established Church, against which the Reformers had contended to the death. Immediately it became clear that the future of English Protestantism must be maintained by the sons of those who had borne the brunt of the conflict in the days of the Stuarts, together with the gallant auxiliary forces which the progress of the centuries had rallied to their side. Such were the circumstances that led Dr. Mackennal, Dr. Berry, and Rev. Hugh Price Hughes to summon the first Congress of the Free Churches in Manchester, November, 1892, which in 1896, at the Fourth Congress, held at Nottingham, crystallized into the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, representing the thirteen sections of Evangelical Free Churches, and standing for about ten thousand congregations. In his Presidential address, at the for-

mation of the National Council, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes said:—

"The astonishing unanimity and ease with which one of the most novel and far-reaching movements of our time has assumed national proportions are due to two causes. *First* of all, the entire disappearance of our own internal differences. In the early days of the Reformation there was not much love lost between the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, and the Society of Friends. When these ancient dissenters settled down into friendly relations with one another, the advent of Methodism produced fresh controversy. Now, we all agree to differ on points of interpretation, while we realize our fundamental agreement on the essential facts of the Christian religion. . . . The Head of the Church has so guided our thoughts that there is now, for the first time in our history, no reason whatever why we should not present a united front to every external foe and coöperate heartily in all the internal work of the Christian Church."

"The *second* cause of the Movement we represent is a very different and a very sad one. It is the portentous revival in our midst of extreme mediæval clericalism, which our fathers believed had disappeared for ever from England. . . . The attack on us, especially in the small towns and villages, has of late become so vigorous and so bitter that it has forced us together in self-defense. . . . We all appreciate the venerable history, the devout learning, the splendid services, and the saintly lives which have enriched the Anglican Church, but in the language of an ancient proverb, we are bound to say that while we are friends of Plato, we are yet more friends of truth. This disappearance of our own internal differences is the *negative* cause for our acting to-

gether; but the *positive* cause is our unanimous determination that, God helping us, England, the land of civil and religious freedom, the land of Gospel light, shall never sink to the degraded level of Spain."

These sentences convey a just conception of the early grounds on which the great movement of wider denominational unity of the National Council was based; but it is only fair to add that our scope has greatly widened, as we have learnt the many and great advantages that accrue from united action; and certainly our relations with the leaders of the Anglican Church are of a much more cordial and understanding nature. We are discovering that there is a large body of opinion within the National Church, which, equally with ourselves, reprobates the Romanizing proclivities to which we have referred.

There is one outstanding difference between the Union of the Free Churches in England, as presented by the National Council of Evangelical Free Churches, and the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. In the latter case the members are appointed officially by the constituent bodies. In other words, it is composed of the duly elected representatives of the various churches or denominations that have agreed to the formation of the Council. There are, of course, advantages in this plan. But, after due consideration, Hugh Price Hughes and his friends set it aside in favor of unity of a more democratic character. Our unit is not the aggregate church or denomination, but the individual congregations of believers meeting for worship in their respective places of worship, week by week. We are a Federation, *not* of centralized national ecclesiastical assemblies, but of the local churches or congregations of every evangelical denomination. In this way there is no

danger of compromising any of the associated bodies in their national and official character. We do not commit them in any way that might lead to their embarrassment, or interfere with their internal autonomy. We act only in relation to those objects that we have in common, and no church is collectively committed by anything that the National Council decides.

The constitution is as follows: Each year the churches or congregations in a given town are asked to appoint representatives, of whom one at least should be a woman and one a young person, to the local Council. The number of representatives is in proportion to the numerical strength of the appointing body. These local Councils meet monthly to deal with the religious interests that are common to all the Christian communities they represent.

From each Council representatives are appointed to the County or District Federation, which comprises all the Councils of its area, and is the medium through which concerted action can be taken throughout that part of the country on religious, moral, or national questions.

The president and secretary of each local Council are expected to visit each of the churches, during the year; and the president and secretary of each Federation are expected to pay an annual visit to each of the Councils.

The General Committee is composed in part of representatives chosen by the Federations, and in part of representatives chosen by ballot at the great annual gathering held each spring.

The objects of the National Council are indicated in the following extract from the constitution:—

(a) To advocate and exemplify the New Testament doctrine of the Catholic Church, in accordance with which all who partake of a common life in the one cruci-

fied, risen and Divine Redeemer are to be brought in the unity of the Spirit into fellowship and coöperation; whilst full liberty and autonomy are given to each Christian community to fulfil its own appointed witness and mission.

(b) To enable the Free Churches to take united counsel and action where their common interests and responsibilities are involved, leaving to the several denominations those which more properly fall within their individual province.

(c) To promote the federation of the Evangelical Free Churches with a view to the most effective use of their resources for the extension of the Kingdom of God.

(d) To facilitate fraternal intercourse and fellowship in the spiritual life and activities of the Churches.

(e) To maintain liberty of conscience and to take action in all matters affecting the interests, duties, rights, or privileges of the associated Churches.

(f) To foster the unity and coöperation of Evangelical Churches throughout the world, and thus to promote the evangelization of all nations.

(g) To promote the application of the law of Christ in every relation of human life.

(h) To extend and develop the organization for realizing the above objects through the Annual Assembly, National Executive, Welsh Executive, Women's Auxiliary, District Federations and Local Councils, and by such other means as the work in its world-wide aspects may demand.

One of the most extraordinary results of the work of the chosen representatives of the newly-constituted National Council was the compilation of a catechism, which might meet the demand for a modern manual of catechetical instruction, and at the same time exhibit the substantial agreement of the Evangelical Free Churches in relation to the fundamental and essential truths of Christianity. This catechism has had an immense circulation, and is an extraordinary testimony to our solidarity in doctrine.

The thousand local Councils and fifty County Federations make a strongly articulated network in touch with the central office; and like the efferent and afferent nerves of the human body, enable the Free Churches to act together with great precision and celerity whenever there is need. In two or three days every town and village in England can be mobilized for some great issue; whilst each local group is able to concentrate its influence on the immediate wrongs that need righting, or the right that needs achieving.

To take one city for example. Let it be Liverpool. Eighty churches are affiliated in the Liverpool Council, for opposition to the drink traffic and impurity, for the affirmation of civic righteousness, for combined open-air services and parish home visitation, for the provision of Free Church services in public institutions, etc. The rural areas are also covered by or included in this network of organization, and the inspiration communicated to villages, ministers and congregations, and the help afforded in cases of oppression are very much appreciated. It should be noted that women's auxiliaries are connected with our more influential Councils, and are increasing in numbers and power. To take one branch of their concerted effort—during the last year, six hundred cases were dealt with in rescue homes, and girls' guilds were maintained with forty thousand members.

Within the last two or three years a further advance towards closer union of the Free Churches in England has been strongly and eloquently advocated by Rev. J. H. Shakespeare, whose proposals have aroused great interest and are still being considered. At his suggestion the great Unions and Conferences have been asked to appoint representatives to explore the possibilities of forming a United Free Church. This proposal does not im-

ply that the present denominational ties should cease to exist, but that all churches should be known and styled as branches of the United Free Church of England. In brief, it should be on the model of the United States of America—many but one. The churches have so far acted on Mr. Shakespeare's proposals, that four committees have been set up to consider: (1) Faith, (2) the Ministry, (3) Evangelization, (4) Constitution. In each case the discovery of the amount of common agreement has exceeded even the most sanguine expectations, and is likely to have important results in the training of the ministry and in other directions. It is too early to predict what will be the result of the prolonged consideration of these questions; but, even if the original ideal of the Free Church of England is not immediately attainable, there will, almost certainly, eventuate a closer coöperation between the officials and governing bodies of the various Free Church denominations, thus combining the characteristic features of the American and English systems.

One remarkable result of the approximation of the Free Churches towards unity has been in the increased cordiality of the relations between the Free Churches and the Anglican Church. Indeed, conferences have been held between influential representatives of either side, in concert with a similar movement in the United States, with the view of promoting the visible unity of the Body of Christ on earth.

From Canada, Australia, Scotland, and the mission field we have tidings of the coming together of men of various creeds and different ecclesiastical systems. It seems as though the prayer of our Lord is on the eve of fulfilment; and at any moment we may witness the sudden fulfilment and crystallization of our ideals. This,

however, we must bear in mind, that the centre of unity is not in agreement on doctrine, system, or method, but in the closer union of each individual member in the Body of Christ. He is the Head, and as we recognize Him as such, and come into closer sympathy and touch with Him, we shall find ourselves ignoring minor differences, and discovering a closer affinity with all who are similarly attracted. And this, also, is certain that the Free Churches will never allow their desire for unity to fetter or dim their witness against the system of doctrine and practise connoted by the terms "Sacerdotal" and "Sacramentarian." In their heroic conflict with that system the fathers suffered the loss of all things, and willingly laid down their lives, and their children are pledged to maintain that witness and conflict to the end.

F. B. Meyer.

AMERICA'S ORIENTAL PROBLEM FROM THE CHRISTIAN POINT OF VIEW

By Sidney L. Gulick, D.D., Advisory Secretary of Commission on Relations With the Orient of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, New York City.

International and interracial relations have moral, as well as, economic and political aspects. The pagan national policies of the past have ignored the moral factor. Hence have come the great tragedies of history, the greatest of which is that in which we are now involved.

When California passed her anti-alien land-law in 1913, missionaries in Japan, realizing how serious a blow would be dealt to the entire cause of Christian missions in Japan were a solution not found based on moral principles, sent a memorial to the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, asking for the establishment of a commission to study the American-Japanese problem from the standpoint of the teachings of Jesus.

In due time—early in 1914—that commission was established and a vigorous nation-wide campaign of education has been carried on through the years. An embassy of the Federal Council was sent to Japan—consisting of the then president of the Council, Dr. Shailer Mathews and the writer.

The principles emphasized by the commission for the solution of the problem have been none other than the historic principles of the Christian faith, that God is the Father of all men and that all men are brethren. It has been contended that in some way the principles of human brotherhood must be applied in the concrete to the relations of the white and yellow races. New contacts are inevitable because of the new world conditions pro-

duced by man's mastery of the forces of nature. These contacts must be made Christian, that is, brotherly, or they will be pagan, that is, brutal.

But it has also been contended that in our zeal for the principle of human brotherhood, we must not forget that economic conditions, political relations and race divergencies are facts of tremendous significance and that efforts to apply the principle of brotherhood must not ignore the laws that rule in these realms. The solution of America's Japanese problem is not to be found by emphasizing the moral factor and ignoring the other factors, but only by applying in concrete ways to the economic, the political and the race factors and relations, the principles of human brotherhood.

Among Marquis Okuma's remarkable utterances was that one, dealing with the "California question" as the problem is referred to in Japan. He stated (May, 1913), at an important conference of statesmen, educators, editors and Christian leaders, that the problem was one that could not be solved by diplomacy, or by Japanese retaliatory legislation, or by war, or even threats of war, but only by appeal to American Christians to apply the principles of Christianity to the solution of the vexed question.

During the entire period of American-Japanese tension, statesmen, educators, business men and travelers have been insisting that America and Japan are friends and are going to maintain the historic friendship.

Premier Terauchi's recent utterance regarding the friendship of America and Japan was a notable event: "By the participation of the United States in the present world war our ties have been strengthened by a community of interests and we are on the eve of joining our resources in chastizing our common obdurate foes in the

cause of the peace of the World." These remarkable words should help to quell the mutual apprehension of Japanese and Americans.

Recent letters from Japan show that some in that land regard with misgiving America's large military and naval development. They surmise that when we have completed our conflict with Germany, flushed with our success and our power we shall seek to dominate the Pacific and the Far East.

There are Americans on the other hand who repeatedly assert that Japan's real purpose in her expanding armaments is to attack us in the near future.

These utterances of good-will on the one hand and these suspicions and surmisings on the other, entertained by men on both sides of the Pacific, should not mislead us. There are real problems concerning the relations of America and Japan. They are still unsolved. While they should not be exaggerated, neither should they be ignored. The real differences over which tension has been developed still remain. A year and more ago the brilliant editor of the *Kokumin Shumbun* stated his view of the situation in this startling sentence: "America and Japan are like two trains running at full speed toward each other on a single track. Unless something intervenes a collision is inevitable." News recently to hand shows that he still feels the statement to be true. The friendly words of statesmen at banquets no less than the writing of partisan and patriotic jingoes must be carefully scrutinized. Both must be in a measure discounted. Patent facts must be given more weight than mere words.

The situation will not be straightened out nor will our relations be steady and safe until real problems are really solved. It will repay us to study briefly what the problems are.

The Situation.—Our problems are due to the rapid shrinkage of space in recent decades, to the immediate contact of virile races that have experienced millenniums of divergent evolution, and to the impact of the West upon the East. We must solve these problems by reason and character or they will overwhelm us all in ruin.

1. The daily press of both countries gives clear evidence of widespread suspicions and animosities, with frequent predictions of war. In each land many believe that the conscious policy of the other nation is definite preparation for aggression. Each vehemently urges its own Government to make adequate preparations against wanton attack.

2. The diplomatic correspondence between America and Japan regarding California's anti-alien land-law has ended in a deadlock. This gives occasion for belief in many quarters that the difficulties in the case are insoluble. In the United States it gives color to the argument that Japan is trying to force open our doors for free immigration. In Japan it appears to justify the contention that America as a whole refuses to keep her treaty pledges—that America is a treaty-breaking land.

3. An anti-Japanese campaign has for years been in progress in America. It is malicious and untruthful. It has produced numberless full-page editorials, insulting cartoons, and a "Hymn of Hate." It poisons the mind, not only by direct falsehoods, but by insinuation, assumption, and implications. It seeks to raise suspicion of the honesty and sincerity of every Japanese no less than of the leaders and of the Government.

4. Japan's own problems, industrial, political, financial, international, moral, and religious, are naturally little understood by Americans—and least of all by sensational writers. Yet, in spite of colossal ignorance, they

discuss Japanese affairs with an air of omniscience.

5. The complicated international situation in the Far East, moreover, where Russia, Germany, France, and England for a century have intrigued and fought, have made treaties and secured vast special privileges, and have done much to disintegrate the Chinese Empire, which no doubt also played its own game of duplicity, intrigue, graft, and greed, and displayed its incompetence and injustice. All the nations have, more or less consciously, striven to bottle up Japan in her own restricted land and prevent her from enjoying equal opportunity with themselves in the wide world—all this mixture of complications and problems is dismissed with a wave of the hand when discussion turns on Japan's high-handed methods in Korea, Manchuria and China by which she has sought to prevent being bottled up and throttled.

6. Whatever the problems may be, and whatever the wrongs done or suffered, the important thing now is that America should deal with Japan in ways that are just and even generous. If matters are allowed to drift as they have been drifting for years they may easily grow serious and suddenly turn acute. Over some relatively trivial incident the feeling of America and Japan may suddenly become so intense that a solution will be impossible.

Is it not clear that those who love justice, truth, and good neighborliness between the East and West, should coöperate in effective ways to direct public opinion and to mold public action? Should they not be as active in guiding our nation into policies that are right and that make for international justice and peace as are those who, whatever their motives, are, in fact, doing and saying things that tend to embroil us in war?

Core of Japanese Problem.—The problem is twofold —the treatment of Japanese in America, and American and Japanese policies in China.

This first question does not concern the matter of immigration, as is popularly believed. Japan is not demanding nor intending to insist upon free immigration in this country. The "Gentlemen's Agreement," in operation and faithfully administered by the Japanese Government since 1908, has stopped labor immigration from Japan. The number of adult Japanese males in America diminished between 1907 and 1915 by 15,139.

The anti-Japanese agitation in America, nevertheless, ignoring Japan's faithful administration of the "Gentlemen's Agreement," insists on fresh differential race legislation to meet an imaginary danger. This legislation, past and prospective, is resented by the Japanese on two grounds. It is regarded as insulting because it ignores what Japan has done, is doing, and says she will continue to do to prevent the difficulties we feel through the coming of Japanese labor immigrants. Such legislation not only does not appreciate what Japan has already done for us, more effectively indeed than we could have accomplished by our own legislation—as proven by the difficulty of enforcing our Chinese exclusion laws—but it also expresses in the clearest way, distrust of her promises to continue faithfully to administer the "Gentlemen's Agreement." How can friendship be maintained or even asserted when distrust expresses itself in legislation? Such anti-Japanese legislation, past and prospective, is regarded as insulting, also because it insists on race differential treatment which Japanese inevitably regard as bemeaning to their honor and dignity as a race.

Japan has proven her willingness to stop labor immi-

gration to the United States by her own action, out of desire to maintain friendly relations with us. She wishes that we shall reciprocate and deal with her problems in a similarly friendly way. She resents race-discriminating legislation on our part because it brands Japanese merely because they are Japanese, and refuses to give those who are lawfully in America treatment similar to that which we accord to any other people.

Then there is the problem of American and Japanese policies in China. Many Americans think Japan plans to gain such political control of China as practically, if not formally, to destroy her sovereignty and to close the "open door."

On the other hand, many Japanese think that America plans to block Japanese legitimate and absolutely necessary expansion of trade and influence in China, that America desires and intends to use China as her own private field for expansion in commerce and for investment of capital to the exclusion of Japan, and that Japan's future welfare depends upon her ability to block America's imperialistic plans in the Orient no less than upon her ability to prevent such further European expansion there as does not afford her full recognition and opportunity.

These, I take it, are the central questions at issue threatening to mar the friendly relations of America and Japan.

The Solution.—The United States Government might well make public acknowledgment of appreciation of the splendid way in which Japan has administered the "Gentlemen's Agreement." This would help dispel the bogy of the press that Japan is menacing us with a flood of laboring immigrants.

A comprehensive policy and programme should be

adopted dealing with all immigration on a basis free from race discrimination. Such legislation can give equal treatment and opportunity to every race and yet afford complete protection to the Pacific Coast from invasion from Asia, and also protection to our industrial classes from overwhelming cheap labor from every land if such immigration legislation is based on the principle of admitting no more people than we can Americanize.

Legislation is also needed dealing in a thoroughgoing way with the federal protection of all aliens in our land and with the matter of their Americanization. It should provide for federal laws dealing with state or local legislation and with crimes against aliens, for federal supervision of the education of aliens, and for the granting of citizenship to all who qualify, regardless of race, under the above suggested restrictions.

These three proposals adequately carried out would, I am persuaded, remove all ground for friction between America and Japan with regard to Japanese immigration, and also with regard to the proper treatment of those who are here.

In regard to the questions of American and Japanese policies in China, I speak with less assurance, for they deal with matters upon which I have not specialized and do not have adequate knowledge. They are, moreover, complicated to a degree that few Americans can appreciate. As I have already noted, Russian, German, English and French interests, acquired rights, past procedures and present policies all enter in as vital factors. Americans have little knowledge of these facts and little appreciation of their relations to Japanese problems and policies.

We must not forget, moreover, that Japan has learned the bitter lesson that she may not send her in-

creasing population to so-called "white men's lands." She realizes that she must provide for her multiplying millions only in Asia. She has also learned that the governments of Europe have scant regard for the rights, for the sovereignty and even for the vital interests of non-Caucasian nations and races. Such position and power as Japan has to-day she has wrung from an unwilling world by positive achievement of a high order, by astute diplomacy, and by bullets, bayonets, and battleships. Further acquisition by Europe or America of rights, privileges, or territory in China, Japan holds, will not only harm China, but what is more important for her, will endanger her own future welfare.

What now should be American policies in the Orient? Are we prepared to follow the methods of Europe, demanding our place of opportunity and enforcing plans for imperialistic expansion and influence? This is the policy which many in Japan attribute to us, and many in America are actually urging. How should Japanese regard this statement from *The Washington Herald:* "Bombs and dollars are the only things that count to-day. We have plenty of the one. Let us lay in a good supply of the other and blast a path to world leadership as soon as the opportunity presents itself." If this is to be our policy then I doubt not difficulties will increase, suspicions multiply, a hostile spirit develop, and a final clash become inevitable.

I advocate no such policy for the United States. I believe that American influence and opportunity in the Orient will be vastly greater and more profitable by the maintenance of our historic policy of friendship and good-will, based entirely on moral and mutually advantageous commercial, educational, and philanthropic relations rather than upon the adoption of an imperialistic

policy of expansion relying for success upon "bombs and dollars."

The profits of no amount of trade with the Orient could possibly compensate for war, even a short war, with Japan; while the damage to our influence upon all Asia for the uplift of those lands would be incalculable.

For these reasons I earnestly desire that our national policy should be in sharp contrast to the imperialistic and militaristic policies advocated by some; a policy, moreover, so conceived and so worded that it may go out over the country with convincing force. We need a clear statement from influential business and other groups as to our policies in the Orient which would help to allay the rising suspicion in Japan that we plan to bottle her up and throttle her. Such statements would help to steady our own people also by letting them know that the imperialistic expansionists of America do not have the field to themselves. And might not such statements also aid our Government in molding its course, and in resisting the subtle and sinister forces that wish to utilize it for their own selfish ends? Should not the leaders and creators of public opinion declare with the utmost clearness and with strongest emphasis that America seeks no opportunity in China that is not in harmony with the interests of both Japan and China, and that America will never resort to force to gain or to maintain commercial advantage or vested privilege?

Clear declarations from time to time along these lines, and also affirmations at suitable times by our Government of such a policy as this, would render important aid to the cause of world-justice and peace by educating our own people in the fundamental principles of our international relations and policies and in allaying doubts and suspicions so easily raised both here and in the Ori-

ent by sensational, unreliable and sometimes even malicious newsmongers.

In conclusion, then, if America will adjust her immigration and naturalization legislation so as to remove invidious and humiliating race discrimination and will adopt an Oriental policy that repudiates imperialistic ambitions to be won by "bombs and dollars," and that insists on making all international policies in China place as a foremost consideration proper regard for China's own welfare, important steps will have been taken for maintaining lasting friendship and peace with both Japan and China, and, indeed, with the whole world.

Sidney L. Gulick.

ESSENTIALS TO CHRISTIAN UNION

By F. M. RAINS, Secretary Foreign Christian Missionary Society, Cincinnati, O.

THE union of believers is a question as old as Christianity itself. The subject threads the New Testament and Church history. Our Lord, who knew the ambitions and weaknesses and all the limitations of men, prayed that His disciples might be one, even before the Church was established. The Lord of glory longed to see His followers one harmonious body.

His loving heart is grieved over a divided Church. We cannot close our eyes to the humiliating fact. The force of truth and the progress of the Church are weakened by stubborn parties, alienated denominations, and warring sects.

Great spiritual leaders are crying to God for a better day. An increasing number of Spirit-filled men long to see the whole family of God reunited. This is the Church's most urgent and over-mastering need.

Among others, the following essentials to Christian union may be mentioned:

I. *An Appreciation of the Subject.*—To even mention the subject of union often calls forth prompt and emphatic objections from many good men who sincerely believe that God is pleased with the present divided state. The objections run about as follows:

(1) There is an advantage in having different churches. They do more for the whole Kingdom of God than if they were in one organization. They provoke one another to love and good works!

(2) We are told it is well to have different types of

faith and varying forms of worship to satisfy different tastes and temperaments, and to meet varying intellectual standards and grades of culture. We are particularly reminded that of course "all cannot see alike."

(3) Family histories and traditions, it is claimed, should be conserved in the interest of the denomination in which the believer was reared. There is a tremendous loss in breaking away from one's early associates and training. Such action shows a lack of respect and loyalty to parents and family and church.

(4) Another objection. One great united Church would demand a strong central, ecclesiastical power to hold it together and direct its powers and activities, to insure its proper government and greatest efficiency. And in essential features this would be a reproduction of the Roman Church.

(5) A serious problem: The property interest of existing churches, involving many millions of dollars. Questions of large endowments, entailed interests, complicated and intricate bequests, corporate institutions and foundations, and trust funds and charters from sovereign states, etc., etc. These and other questions all arise to make union, with many devout souls, seem to be impracticable and inexpedient. The loss of property and influence would probably never be equaled by the doubtful advantages of the proposed union. The readjustments would require many years, and those now living could never become perfectly harmonized to the new order.

(6) Who has not heard earnest prayers thanking God for the present divisions? Have we not been taught that each denomination was born in the providence of God to emphasize and enforce some special and important truth? The round of our denominations is necessary to

make the whole circle of religious truth receive due importance.

(7) One other outstanding objection to the union proposed by the religious pacifists. It is this: The oneness of which the Bible speaks does not consist in having the same name, or of members and churches sustaining the same relation to each other. A thousand people may be thrown together, say the objectors, and yet there will be no real union among them. They may all propose to be guided by the Bible, but their views may be so discordant that they are not one in any good sense.

Over against these and other objections we must place the teaching and promise of Jesus Christ, our Lord's prayer for the union of His disciples in the seventeenth chapter of John, and the clear and distinct note in the teaching of the Apostle Paul rebuking divisions and enjoining unity.

"And other sheep I have which are not of this fold; they also I must bring and they shall hear my voice; and they shall become one flock and one shepherd" (John 10:16). This passage reveals the mighty, world-embracing purpose of Jesus Christ. He saw other sheep than His own people. The fold of Israel was very select and very exclusive. Narrowness was the temper of the Jews. Jesus included the Gentiles among the sheep He would also call; Jews and Gentiles are to be one flock. Christ, as the Good Shepherd, has shrunk from no effort, from no sacrifice to effect the grandest unity of which mankind is capable. No less than a world-wide, spiritually united flock, bearing His name, animated by His spirit, is the desire of our imperial and reigning Lord.

The ground for this union is that the one Shepherd alone can conserve the one flock. His Divine nature, His priceless redemption, His spiritual authority lie at the

foundation of the Church's unity, and for such a structure no other foundation could suffice. The small objections offered in the face of the Redeemer's wonderful promise in John 10:16 are insignificant indeed.

"Neither for these alone do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word; that they may all be one, even as thou Father art in me and I in thee, that they may also be one in us: that the world may believe that thou didst send me" (John 17:20-21). Not only does He pray for the disciples about Him whom He loved tenderly, but also for that mighty host of believers He sees rising before His eyes in all ages. Glorious vision! Inimitable prayer! His great heart embraces all who may believe, and for them He pours out His soul. What amazing love! He prays for the believers of all generations until the end of time. He prayed for all the martyrs in all the ages, and for that great host who have turned from idols to worship the true God. He prays for the unity of successive generations of believers. It is an essential, vital unity. The ultimate design and result of this oneness is its effect upon the world, that the world may believe. Where His disciples are seen to be of one faith, of one spirit, and one love, the world has better thoughts of God and of His people and of His glorious Church. Think you the puny excuses for parties and divisions can stand in the presence of our Lord's prayer? How insignificant and absolutely meaningless they do appear!

"Now I beseech you brethren through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing and that there be no divisions among you; but that ye be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment" (I. Cor. 1:10). The party spirit ran high in the church at Corinth. They prided themselves on being

uncompromising. Paul shows his indignation at their partisanship by rebuking those who had used his own name as a party watchword. And what matchless men to head parties! There was the gifted Apollos. "His impassioned oratory, his Alexandrian refinement, his allegorizing exegesis, the culture and polish of his style, had charmed the fickle Corinthians." Christ had been divided into fragments. The differences consisted in rabid preferences for certain leaders. Their divisions were the scandal of the church at Corinth. Divisions hinder coöperation. The Head of the Church is dishonored. Unity is strength; division is weakness. Unity begets love; divisions tend to hatred. Conversions are stayed by divisions. Men seek peace. They are slow to cast their lot with those who are flying at one another's throats. A united Church attracts; a divided Church repels. A divided Church leads to a hidden Christ. Hard words make hard hearts. Paul rebukes all parties and all divisions.

II. *An Atmosphere in Which the Union Sentiment May Grow.*—Christian unity will not be realized by any short cut method. It is not a plant to grow up in a night. It may prove a century plant. Nor will any mechanical steps bring it to pass. Our present divisions were centuries in developing. The reunion of the churches will require time, and patience, and labor, and the tolerant spirit, and much earnest prayer. The mandate of no ecclesiastical court or authority will cause the religious bodies of the world to flow together like so many rivers in a common course.

The spirit of confidence and love must first be cultivated. Every man and every church must come to look upon every other Christian man and church in full recognition of all their faith and sacrifice and consecration.

We must see each other as Christians and feel toward each other as such before real progress can even begin. We must look upon the whole Christian world as a broken, alienated family, with misunderstandings, unfounded suspicions, and misconceptions of loyalty and duty. And we must recognize also that all want to do what will truly please the Father. This attitude will help to make an atmosphere out of which a new day will emerge. We must assume that every other Christian has as much interest in the larger and better things as we ourselves have. There must first be *unity of mind.* "That ye be perfected together in the same *mind* and in the same judgment." There must be oneness of disposition and oneness of view in opposition to the divisions that now prevail. This was a characteristic of the early Church. "And the multitude of them that believed were of *one heart* and soul." When the same spirit is dwelling in men's hearts it will appear in unity of sentiment and unity of opinion and unity of purpose.

Again, there must be *unity of teaching and of utterance.* "That ye all speak the same thing," is an exhortation from high authority. Then will the union sentiment find a place in which it can grow. The inner unity must have an outward expression. Hence the necessity of interchange of views, conversations upon the union question, and conferences as to how to best effect it. Every pulpit should ring out clear and strong on this one of the greatest questions before the Christian world at this hour. It is important that many tracts and books be written, that articles appear in papers and magazines, all urging the great question upon the attention and consciences of Christian believers. Provision should be made for addresses upon the subject in conventions. In the gatherings of Christian people everywhere sentiment

should be made that will insure the union feeling and attitude.

Party cries like those that filled the church at Corinth must be hushed. Men that are at heart one, should take care lest their public utterances convey an opposite impression. In all free churches there will of course be more or less discussion; but this should be conducted in such a way as "to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

The atmosphere of Christian union may be created in a very effective way by making it *prominent in the public worship*. The singing of songs breathing the union spirit will be most helpful. There are many such songs in our hymnals. If these songs are interpreted by the minister, or some explanation of their origin or history given, it will help to emphasize their importance. If our Lord thought it important to pray for the union of His disciples, we may well follow His example and pray before the whole congregation that the day may speedily come when all of God's children may see eye to eye and walk hand in hand. Such prayers will be heard in Heaven and will have a fine reflex influence for good, and an educational value for all classes in the Church. The union must be a spiritual one and the means to this end must likewise be spiritual. Sermons should be preached on the subject at least once or twice a year. Special union services may be held in the churches with excellent results. Union rallies in different communities will prove of immense value. We may not be as far apart as we imagine ourselves to be. It will do good for the churches to take a log of their sailings. Let us magnify the points wherein we agree. If we will speak frankly face to face, heart to heart, about points of differences in a brotherly way we will make progress.

It would be very impressive if groups of churches would hold *union communion services.* In the smaller cities such services could be held with splendid results. Groups of churches might do likewise in the larger cities. What would more deeply impress a community than to see all the Christian people sitting at the Lord's table together, remembering the Saviour's dying love? It would be an event never to be forgotten. It would prove the beginning of a new era in that place. It would certainly have a tremendous influence upon the churches themselves, and affect profoundly those who are not members. The attendance might not be large in the community at first, but it would grow in numbers and in significance. We must come to have a passion for union as some have for missions, or for temperance, or for civic righteousness.

Union revival meetings, union missionary gatherings, Sunday-school conferences, union temperance gatherings, conferences in the interest of civic righteousness, and other gatherings where the whole Christian community can be brought together will all help to make a wholesome atmosphere wherein the sectarian spirit will wither and all the denominational lines will fade out, and where the spirit of fellowship and of union will grow.

As we come closer to Jesus Christ, and come to understand the motives and purposes of each other, party lines will become less and less distinct. You have seen, passing through the country in the spring time, the long rows of wheat sown with a drill. When the wheat is young the rows are perfectly distinct. As the wheat grows larger and the heads become heavy with golden grain and gradually ripen for the harvest, the rows slowly fade out and the heads fall together so that the marks of the drill are scarcely, if at all, discernible. As

Christian people of the various sects grow to be more like Christ and ripen into the Divine life, the denominational lines will pass away and give place for one great united body of Christian believers, bearing only His inspiring name.

III. *Another essential of Christian unity is a proper recognition of what is meant by this union.*—Many problems will pass away with a correct understanding of the subject.

Christian union does not mean a union of jarring sects, belligerent denominations and pugilistic ecclesiastics. The farther these are apart the better—the less harm they will do.

Nor does Christian union mean that we are to see every question from the same view-point. It is not essential that we have the same thoughts and opinions, like so many bullets from the same mold. That would be monotonous indeed.

Nor does Christian union require that all dress alike, and all adopt the same social forms and customs; nor that all speak the same shibboleth.

Nor does Christian union mean that a church is to "come over" to some other church or churches. The most effective method is not one of absorption. On the contrary a church might well continue its present pastor and local work, reproducing in its life the New Testament teaching and principles, the original faith and name. It would be a tremendous loss to sever the present cordial family and pastoral relations. Let each church continue in its present place of worship, unless it is thought wise to unite with some other local congregation of like faith and purpose.

Christian union does not require the same order and form in public worship or the same methods in manage-

ment of the local church. In these and many other matters diversity and liberty may be exercised, while maintaining the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Let us be careful not to place upon believers a yoke of uniformity. Some will remember the hard-fought battles over the position of the body during prayer, and instrumental music in the public worship, and the legitimacy of missionary organizations, etc. One church insisted upon *one cup* at the communion table, and not two, or more, because Jesus took "the cup" and blessed it, not cups!

Believers may differ as widely as the poles upon mere questions of opinion. Why not? The churches may very well adopt as their slogan: In *essentials* unity, in *non-essentials* liberty. The things clearly and definitely commanded by Jesus Christ are to be regarded as *essentials;* the things not definitely commanded by him may be regadred as *non-essentials.* Matters of faith relate to essentials; matters of opinion relate to non-essentials. Testimony is the ground and source of faith. Where testimony begins faith begins; where testimony ends faith ends. He who believes less than the testimony is skeptical; he who believes more than the testimony is credulous; and he whose faith is equal to and corresponds with the testimony is a Christian philosopher. In faith unity, in opinion liberty, in both love. Every effort at Christian union will come to naught if love is not the dominating force.

In the days of the New Testament the rankest sectarian spirit existed. It was an age in which party spirit was rife. Between the Jews and Samaritans there was an historic cleavage; they had no dealings with each other. The Gentile looked upon the Jew as a barbarian; the Jews regarded the Gentiles as dogs.

Out of all the strife and confusion there was born and grew up a glorious, united Church, in which the apostles rejoiced, and by which the world was blessed, and the Lord was honored. This Church Paul calls the one body of Jesus Christ.

What was the real basis of the union of the widely scattered churches? They were composed of those of different nationalities, different religious and philosophies, different tongues. It was the wonderful proposition *that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God.* They believed in a Christ that lived and died; they also believed in a Christ who lives and reigns forevermore. Glorious fact! Herein is the world's hope and the Church's inspiration. That united and invincible Church swept the world. Paganism wilted before it. It scattered the seeds of a new civilization. It was the beginning of a new era. Its faith and enthusiasm challenged the admiration of all men. Yes, the foundation of the New Testament Church was laid in one supreme truth. That truth is the enduring basis of Christian union in all the ages. No human creed ever written will provide a basis of union suited to all ages and to all nations. That has been tried often and failure has been written over every effort.

There can be no enduring union without liberty. Men's knowledge of truth is constantly changing. This is God's order. If a man writes down in a creed just what he will believe a decade hence, he is hopeless. Division is sure to be a result. Christianity is progressive. First the blade, and then the ear, and after that the full corn in the ear is the teaching of Jesus and the law of the Kingdom. Unless there is freedom to think, room for the growth of the soul and of the intellect, Christianity will perish from the face of the earth. "Freedom

of thought, freedom of action within the prescribed area of rational responsible beings, is the zenith of all aspirations of the human heart."

The whole Church of God must catch the spirit of the liberty set forth in Paul's letter to the Galatians. Light must not be shut out if we would enjoy real union. Growth must not be arrested. The blinds must not be pulled down. The windows of the soul must be left open. "The truest liberty on earth is liberty of conscience; and this lost, all other liberty is but a name—a charm that lulls to sleep."

The world grows, faith is enlarged, methods change, the Gospel satisfied the longings of all men, in all climes and in all ages. Men's vision of God grows clearer, and Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, and to-day and forever. When the Church is united our Lord will soon see the travail of His soul and be satisfied.

NEXT STEPS IN COMMUNITY RELIGION

By Joseph Ernest McAfee, B.D., Secretary of the Board of Home Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., New York City.

There is danger that we shall expect preachments to get us out of the present distressing muddle of organized religion. They help, to be sure. Even the foolishness of preaching will save some. It is important to exalt tolerance and forbearance and brotherly love and broadmindedness and the irenic spirit and all of the other virtues essential to the programme of humans abiding together on the earth in the presence of high heaven, but when all of us are compelled to live and move and have our religious being under a system set up to frustrate sincere attempts to practice these virtues we are convicted of a sort of duplicity in pressing our preachments. Sectarian pride and bigotry are bound to thrive under a sectarian system. To eradicate the vices while preserving and fostering the system is a futile hope.

It is much as though the inebriate, lectured to leave off his bad habits, were set adrift on the street lined with saloons in either direction where former boon companions beckon at every door to join in accustomed revels. These latter days we have learned more common sense in dealing with inebriety. The vices of intemperance disappear with the saloon. The cure of the confirmed drunkard is difficult, to be sure, but the bare removal of temptation has revealed a refreshing wholesomeness in unspoiled human nature which few had the faith to believe existed.

The illustration may refuse to go on all fours in the religious playground, but it is still suggestive. We are convicted of ineptitude in the attempt to preach down the vices at the heart of our sectarian system in re-

ligion. In church comity conferences ardent protestations of love for the brethren and of abomination of sectarian narrowness are heard on every side. Almost invariably the protestants pass out to denominational field service to fall at once from the high graces they have so feelingly professed. This is commonly the fate not alone of Methodist district superintendents, whose creed allows them to fall from grace, but also that of the staunchest determinists of the Calvinistic sects. I think I have never taken part in a comity conference but that almost immediately thereafter charges of hypocrisy have been lodged against one and another of those who participated in the brotherly discussions and who subscribed to the noble resolutions unanimously adopted. They had gone about their business in promoting and working under our sectarian system, and of course they had belied their unsectarian agreements.

This state of affairs has generated an appalling cynicism. As one saddened commentator remarked the other day, "My experience with comity programmes leads me to find in them only comedy with the other fellow enjoying the laugh." We ought, indeed, all of us to have a keener sense of humor, if no other virtue can save us, than to make these brotherly agreements unless we shall be frank and brave enough to grapple with the system which breeds the most of these vices so universally deplored. Human nature is not so desperately bad as we imagine it. If Christians are only given a reasonable chance to love one another and work with each other they will do it. And a mere tithe of our preaching will keep them true where now their overwhelming temptations insure one long succession of falls. To preach fellowship and practice sectarianism is enough to make pessimists and cynics of the saintliest.

I suppose many of us sincerely believe we are trying to abolish sectarianism. Few pretend really to work at it. If we meant what we profess we should go at the business differently. We now preach federation with all our might. This aims to reduce the scandal while preserving the system. We urge a community to bring its divided religious forces together, but it must keep open the seams of the fabric. Churches should federate, not combine. Or, if they insist upon combining, they must be careful to plaster the name of one of the recognized sects upon the combination. We deploy before them the dread history of the discredited "union" church, and make it altogether clear that their only hope of safety among the billows of the ecclesiastical sea is secure anchorage to one or another of the standard denominations. (They may put out to sea if only they will stay anchored.) The agent of our federation movement must pack his grip and move on to other fields of promotion at once it appears that a community is determined to organize a community church, loyal to community ideals and unaffiliated with any one of the recognized sectarian religious bodies of our American hierarchy.

This sectarian impulse carries us further still. It dominates even the most advanced hopes of church union. No one has yet seriously projected a church union which abolishes sectarianism. Our farthest ambition sets us striving for one big sect. Our doctrine of the church as a divine institution reeks with this virus. The scandal which we deplore is not that the church is sectarian, but that it is not grandly enough sectarian. The spirit of separatism dominates "church unity." Let us all get together so that we can the more magnify the divine exclusiveness of this unique institution. Let us extract the divinity from the rest of the social organism so that

we can sublimate this one institution among the many. This is essentially a separatist doctrine. The more we make the church a divine institution by that process the more "godless" we leave other institutions of society. This propaganda seeks to rally all our forces to build and solidify a cult. It is thoroughly hierarchic. It has no word of condemnation for hierarchy as such; it deplores its present irresponsibility and consequent weakness and seeks to entrench it where none of the profane forces of democracy and utility and pragmatism and other such infidelities can lay their coarse hands upon it!

All this goes to show how far we have yet to advance in our thinking, not to speak of our programmes, before we shall arrive at the solution of the problems of our American religious organization.

We will think more clearly when we have taken the next evident steps. Two things we should manifestly do at once. First, we should accept the community principle, take an unequivocal, brave stand upon it. "Making the church the servant of the community" has become a bromide of our ecclesiastical patter, but we are almost as arbitrary as ever in prescribing what the character of that service shall be. We do not accept the mastership of the community over its servant. Most of the outstanding instances of community religious organization are recognized as more or less rebellious against the ecclesiastical system. They have to rebel so as to succeed. Put yourself into intimate relations with the denominational leaders in any region where a community church enterprise is being worked out, and you will find them consciously or unconsciously hoping that the enterprise will fail. In their heart of hearts they do not believe in it. They wish the church to serve the community but they do not wish the community to define and direct

that service. It is unnecessary to charge denominational leaders with insincerity and duplicity; they honestly believe that they know better than the community itself what the community wants or ought to want.

Are they not right? Maybe they are. But despotism or arbitrary interference from the outside is no way to hallow the community spirit, however benevolent may be the motives back of such interference. In short, our churchmanship has not yet accepted the community principle. Our high professions of community service, and the dedication of the church to it, are accompanied by mental reservations which frustrate the purposes of the programme. You cannot bestow democracy upon people. They must themselves work it out or it is not the real thing. The democracy of religious organization can never be achieved so long as we bind communities in our traditional ecclesiastical leading-strings.

We have somewhat more faith in the small community, and its ability to organize and direct its religious life, than we have in the larger community. Here ecclesiastical skepticism is universal. The "union" church in a given community might not prove so dismal a failure in ministering to the spiritual needs of the immediate vicinage, but every experienced ecclesiastical leader will assure you that for the larger purposes of the church in the world it is hopeless. It is shut off from participation in the affairs of the larger spiritual organism.

Is it not a sign of our wilful blindness that we do not even yet see the fallacy of such reasoning? Our arguments run in a vicious circle. We must maintain our vast denominational systems so as to foster the larger community of interest in our local churches, and we must keep our local congregations denominational because the larger spiritual interests are organized de-

nominationally. We begin to trust the smaller community a little because we are forced to do so, but we are ready to trust the larger community with spiritual responsibility not at all. These are parlous times for organizations which fatuously entrench themselves behind the bulwarks of absolutism, even though they may claim an appearance of sanctity. The rising spirit of democracy in the world and especially in our American life will not be content with a fanfare in one or two subordinate or isolated departments of our life. The whole of life bids fair to be democratized, the religious not less than other departments. It will be great shame upon us who now control the destinies of our American religious organization if we do not bravely go the length in trusting democracy, in allowing it to control, to control both the larger and the smaller community life, to control at the peril of making mistakes, to control at the risk of setting aside much which our ecclesiastical traditions make us sure is holy, to control by methods which with all of their shortcomings and misdirections alone offer hope of spiritual health in a democratic order.

Pursuant to this and as a definite next step, our denominational machinery of church extension should be reordered. In the concrete, our twenty or forty denominational home mission boards should be consolidated. They are responsible for the pioneering work of the churches, work on the remaining frontiers and work in those fields of transformed social conditions where old methods are acknowledged by all to be ineffective and where only patient experiment can guide the way. Innate conservatism may justify in the minds of some the perpetuation of our traditional system in older communities. But if we are sincere in our protestations of a desire to rid our society of the evils of sectarianism, what

justification can there be for our approaching every new community and every new problem with an organization which compels the perpetuation of the blight? There is no essential difference in what ought to be the tasks of these several extension agencies, and there is actually less and less difference in the way they go about their work. Each new community needs substantially the same thing done for it that others need,—so far as they need assistance at all. There is little in denominational traditions which qualifies one board to succeed with a new problem when others must fail. Or, if there is, the failing agencies speedily find ways of circumventing or violating their traditions so as to duplicate the successful methods of sister boards.

The present system has not the worst said for it when its waste is deplored. The worst is the necessary sacrifice of the community principle we are all so zealously advocating. The present system simply will not permit us to be intelligently loyal to that principle. Every sectarian extension agency labors under such handicaps now that thoroughly constructive home mission work cannot be done. The segregated home mission boards have reached the point where they must either mark time and be content to muddle along in the "good old ways," or else win success through unworthy encroachment upon the rights and welfare of other denominational boards. The only genius of leadership capable of large or permanent advance under the present organization is a military genius. It must be ruthless of others' interests and win at their expense.

The bare proposal to consolidate our multitude of denominational home mission boards must set aghast half of us and start Jovian laughter among the other half. Which again only shows how far we have yet to go in our

thinking and practice. The early event, however, will check our laughter and set us about this stern task with a determination which will recognize no hindrance. It remains for us to choose whether our home mission agencies shall thus be transformed to give them a consistent purpose worthy of the times or be set to one side and allowed to dwindle and fade away into the oblivion they will deserve if they do not bravely undertake the great redemption.

The natural next step is for groups of brave and clear-visioned men in each denomination to press, each group in its own denominational body, for the appointment of a representative joint committee to look into this business and discover cause why this obviously needed merger shall not be effected. There will, of course, be causes enough advanced. Objections of enormous import and obstacles insuperable will rise up before the early majorities in all the denominational bodies. In even the most advanced the suggestion will demand a boldness not yet conceived and in the more conservative bodies the idea will be recognized at once and unanimously as hopeless. But the choice must be made: Bring these scattered agencies together and concentrate them upon a consistent program based upon the community principle, or else accept the degeneration of all of them and the rise of independent agencies which will be loyal to the community idea. Sectarian extension agencies cannot fulfill the real "home mission" of today.

Every thoughtful church leader knows in advance what the objections most strenuously pressed will be. For one, and foremost, it will be insisted that such a merger would hopelessly cripple each denomination, that without this right arm any denomination will be shorn of its power. Which is true as a fact and valid as an

objection,—if we are not ready to face the issue. That is quite what would happen: denominationalism would eventually disappear. The mightiest single force in American religious life would thus be concentrating its man and money power upon a propaganda among all growing communities to establish the community principle in religious organization and to abolish sectarianism.

Such a merger would fail of living support. On the contrary it would claim enormous support which all the denominational home mission boards cannot now severally touch. Even present supporters of the home mission cause do not in very large proportion support knowingly and enthusiastically a sectarian propaganda, and large funds are withheld from the present program by those who will not take upon their consciences responsibility for what now goes on as home mission work. If only three or four or six of the most numerous religious bodies would thus merge their agencies and join in a programme of advance along community lines, such minor bodies as insist upon a sectarian propaganda would disappear or be reduced to such dimensions as to be inconsequential.

Such a merger would encounter legal obstacles absolutely to forbid. Which is an objection peculiarly difficult to show any patience by this time. In the light of recent industrial history the average layman is thoroughly convinced that the lawyers can do what they want to do, and what they do not want to do they can always find abundant legal barriers to deny. We live in a generation which is rapidly growing rebellious against the dominance of the dead hand. And especially is this true when it appears that the dead hand is of itself nerveless and impotent: only where certain of the living choose to flaunt its ghostly form does it frighten. The dead men who left their thousands or millions to our various home mission boards were not the kind who stood in the way

of progress in their own day, and to make their bequests a block against the progress of succeeding periods was the farthest from their thought and desire. Even if some of the vested funds of boards must be sacrificed to the legalists the loss would be forgotten in the gain. To yield to the caprices of the dead, or what some of the living insist were their unreasonable desires, while the progressive hosts of the living are disregarded and alienated is an excess of ineptitude.

Such a merger would centralize enormous power. So it would. It would release forces for constructive religious organization on a thoroughly democratic basis which now waste most of their energies in futile treadmill rounds. The bugaboo of centralized democratic power does not longer greatly frighten the American people; it will not seriously frighten reconstructed Americans in our churches.

More space than this ought to be taken in defining more clearly the genius of such a proposal. It is far from a massive "union" church movement. The "union" church is a spineless sect whose stock in trade is the negation of everything distinctive in the other sects. This is not an attempt to make all think and believe alike on religious subjects. The community principle does not stifle individuality and suppress wholesome temperamental differences. This move would put the emphasis of the religious propaganda upon religious work and would encourage every variety of idea and belief which would conspire to the more adequate prosecution of the common task. This proposes a merger of the working agencies of the denominations, not of the creed-making bodies. Frankly, it is careless of what becomes of the latter. It is sufficiently loyal to Christ and his gospel to believe that when we do the work we shall know the doctrine, and it confesses to some impatience with that system which assumes to determine the doctrine before we have wrought the work.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PULPIT

CHRISTIAN UNITY PULPIT

"THAT THEY MAY ALL BE ONE"

By ALEXANDER WHYTE, D.D., LL.D., Minister St. George's Church, Edinburgh, Scotland.

"To everything there is a season, and a time to every purpose under the heaven: a time to plant, and a time to pluck up that which is planted; a time to break down, and a time to build up; a time to rend, and a time to sew; a time to keep silence, and a time to speak; a time of war, and a time of peace." Now, as to a time of peace, and a time of planting, and a time of building up. All the world knows that the Church of Scotland, and the United Free Church of Scotland, are engaged at the present moment in an earnest endeavour to make clear to themselves just what are the obstacles that stand in the way of those two churches becoming one church again, as they originally were. There are many motives, of many kinds, in the minds of Christian men and patriotic men among us; many motives moving them toward such a union, if it can at all be accomplished. There is the consolidation and the full efficiency of the whole work of the two churches. There is the immense saving of men and of money that would immediately result from such a union. And there is the harmonious readaptation of the whole life, and work, and experience, and potentiality, and genius of the two churches, in their dealing with the many pressing necessities of the land. There is a great forecast of hope

in many men's minds of what could be done for the people of Scotland, as well as for the people of other lands, if those two churches were one again in counsel, in work, and in worship.

We are not concerned here so much with the past history of the two churches, nor with the present obstacles, real or supposed, that stand in the way of their reunion. We are not to be so much taken up with these outward matters as with the cleansing and the keeping of our own hearts in this present crisis and opportunity. And, in the measure that we succeed, personally and individually, in the opening of our own minds, and in the cleansing and keeping of our own hearts, that will be the best help we can give to this great movement of truth and love. Come, then, and let us examine ourselves as to the character of our thoughts, and feelings, and behaviours toward one another, as members of the two churches, and, still more, as members of the one mystical Body of Christ.

I suppose, and I believe, that there is a very great difference among men in the way they indulge themselves inwardly in party spirit, and in the way they give outward vent to party spirit. But no one can see the real wickedness and the full hatefulness of party spirit like the unhappy man who has discovered that evil thing in his own heart, and who is continually striving to cast it out of his own heart. In his able Bampton Lecture on Party Spirit, Archbishop Whately begins by pointing out that this detestable spirit is, after all, but the abuse and the prostitution of a state of mind that is originally and naturally good. It is a natural thing, and it is surely not a very wrong thing, he argues, for a man to love his own nation, and his own church, and his own city, and his own political and ecclesiastical

party, more than he loves any other nation, or church, or city, or political or ecclesiastical party. Yes, diabolically wicked as party spirit too often becomes; after all, it is but the excess, and the perversion, and the prostitution of an originally natural, and a perfectly proper, principle in the human heart. As long as this world lasts, and as long as human nature remains what it is, there will always be preferences, and prejudices, and parties in the State, and in the very Church of Christ itself. But, then, when party spirit comes to its worst, as it so often does; when party spirit takes full possession of any man's heart, then farewell in that man's heart to all truth and to all love. Indeed, the truth is absolutely hateful to the out-and-out partisan. We all know that, to our shame and pain, to be the case in ourselves, as many of us as are thorough-going party men. We do not want to hear the truth. As many lies as you like against the other party, but not the truth, if it makes for their advantage. No; it is not the pure love of truth that divides us up into such opposite parties in Church and State. It is far more prejudice, and partiality, and ill-will. Nine times out of ten it is our depraved and malignant party spirit. And when a man becomes so depraved in his mind as to hate the truth, love has no longer any home in that man's heart. For truth is just love in the mind, just as love is truth in the heart. "Love suffereth long, and is kind: love envieth not: love seeketh not her own: love rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth: beareth all things, believeth all things, endureth all things." But party spirit is the clean contradiction and overthrow of all that. "No assurances," wrote the prince of historians five and twenty centuries ago, "No assurances, no pledges of either party, could gain credit with the other. The most

reasonable proposals, coming from an opponent, were received, not with candour, but with suspicion. No artifice was reckoned dishonourable by which a party point could be carried. Every recommendation of moderate measures was counted to be either a mark of cowardice or of insincerity. He only was considered a safe man whose violence was blind and boundless. And those who endeavoured to steer a middle course were spared by neither side." Now every syllable of that might have been written yesterday amid our Western civilisation, so true is it to our own political and civic life, and even to our Church life. All our Christian moralists of insight and ability still continue to write in the spirit and power of Thucydides. Listen to one of the greatest of them. Says William Law: "Selfishness and party spirit are very inhuman and very base qualities, even in the things of this world; but in the things of religion they are of a still baser nature. Now this is the greatest evil that the divisions in the Church of Christ have brought forth. For it raises, in every communion, a selfish, partial orthodoxy, which consists in courageously defending all that it has, and in absolutely condemning all that it has not. Now how can truth, and goodness, and religion be more struck at than in that way? And," that great writer concludes, "our laying all this to heart will enable us to live in a divided part of the Church unhurt by its divisions, and it will keep us in a true liberty and fitness to be edified by all the good we hear or see in any other part of the Church. And thus uniting, in heart and mind, with all that is good in all the churches, we will enter into the true communion of saints, and become real members of the Body of Christ, though we are, for the time, confined to the outward worship of only one part of the

Visible Church." Noble words, that might well be written in letters of gold, and hung up in every divinity hall, and assembly corridor, and session house, and church porch in all the land!

And dear old German Jacob Behmen has this kindred and appropriate passage, which might well be hung up beside the golden passage of his great English disciple. "A true Christian," says Jacob, "who is born aright into the Spirit of Christ, has less and less mind to contend and strive about the lesser matters connected with his religion. He has enough to do within himself. A true Christian is, really, of no church. He can dwell at peace surrounded by all the churches. He can enter into them all and take part in all their services without being bound up exclusively and controversially with any of them. He has but one supreme creed, which is Christ in him, the hope of glory. If men would but as fervently seek after love and righteousness as they do after disputatious matters, there would soon be no matters left about which to dispute. What is an honest, simple, Christian man to do amid so many sects and contentions?" asks Jacob. "What, but to keep out of them, and to thank God that he has neither the call, nor the talent, nor the temptation to enter into them. He is to keep his own heart clean and sweet to all men, and hot and bitter only at himself." My brethren, let us lay up these and all such-like things in our hearts, and then practise them in our lives, as our catechism says. And thus the most retired and obscure of us all will make a real and a true contribution toward that union for which the whole of evangelical Scotland professes to be praying and waiting.

But it will no doubt be said that there are able men and truth-loving men and men that no man can accuse of

party spirit, or of a contentious mind, or of a stubborn temper, but who are not quite clear about the proposed union; and, indeed, are sometimes almost disposed to rise up and oppose it openly. Yes, undoubtedly there are such men: quite undeniably there are not a few of such men among us. And I for one will not enter into any argument with those men, lest I be carried away by my remaining party spirit. But I will commend to their own meditation the words of a stout and tenacious Covenanter. He confessed, far too late in his polemical life, that he had come to see more clearly than once he did, that, in the great universe of truth, there are all kinds and all degrees of truth. There are, he said, "principal truths," and there are "subordinate truths," and he now saw that the subordinate truths, for which, at one time, he had gone to the Bass Rock, and to Blackness, must learn to bow and give way before the more principal truths. I begin to see now, he said, that the principal truths are few, compared with the subordinate truths; and, more than that, the principal truths are quite open and clear to the man who wishes to know them, and to be led, and ruled, by them. He was wont to think that it was a principal truth rather to stay at home on Sabbath than to hear the curates. And he used, in his fierce days, to assail the author of "The Saints' Rest" in language that blisters his pages down to this day. I humbly recommend that old Covenanter's acute and true distinction of "principal and subordinate truths" to the reflection of every sturdy controversialist among us, as well as to every good and true man who still looks askance at the coming union. Since I am speaking about the great moralists, ancient and modern, let me ask, Have you ever read that completely overlaid English classic, Paley's "Horæ Paulinæ"? In

that incomparable specimen of Pauline apologetic the able Archdeacon has a fine expression and a fine passage on the Apostle's "acommodating conduct." And that master of the English pen has given us, in that one expression, a characteristically happy description of the Apostle as a controversialist. For everybody who knows Paul at all, knows this about him, that some of the most memorable epochs of his apostolic life arose out of his accommodating conduct. Paul's sweet and beautiful yieldingness, in every matter that touched on his own opinions and on his own practises: that sweet yieldingness, taken along with his absolutely iron will in what was not his own; these two things must be taken together by all those who would imitate that great saint, and who would be found among his apostolical and evangelical successors. Luther, that spiritual genius, only second to Paul himself, hits the whole matter here in a way that would have delighted Paul, and would have reminded him of one of his Master's parables. "If two goats meet each other on a narrow ledge of rock above a deep water, what does Nature teach them to do in that emergency?" asks Luther. "They cannot turn back, and they cannot pass each other, for there is not an inch of spare room. If they were to butt one another, as they were wont to do, both would fall into the depth below, and would both be drowned. What, then, will those two goats do as they stand opposed to one another? Well, wonderful mother Nature has, somehow, managed to teach those two children of hers this great evangelical lesson. The one goat lies down on the narrow ledge, and then the other goat passes over his prostrate neighbour, and thus they both get home in the end of the day, both safe and sound." How beautiful, and how true! Oh! if Luther had only lain

down, and let Zwingli pass over him, how Luther's name would have shone without a stain, and his doctrine without a flaw. And how many sins and sorrows the Reformed Churches would have escaped! A word is enough to the wise. And that word to the wise among us is Paul's always "accommodating conduct," and the wise goats' divine humility.

One immediately fruitful application of the Pauline principle of "accommodating conduct" would be for you to hear, and to read, as you have opportunity, what all the other churches have to say for their principles, and for their positions, and for their practises. I often remember what Dr. John Duncan, the dear old Hebrew Rabbi, once said to our class in the New College. "If," he said, "I met with a man from New England, I would say to him, 'Be sure to read our Scottish Marrow Men'; and if I met a strong Marrow man, I would say to him, 'Before you read any more of your own books, be sure you read some able New Englander.'" Now, none of you have the privilige of hearing the able, and informing, and peace-making speeches that are made in our committees now sitting. All the more, therefore, you should read with all your deliberation, and with your most hospitable mind, all such speeches, and pamphlets, and articles as set forth the principles and the positions of the other church. And then, after that, let that peace-making practise extend through the whole of your intellectual and spiritual life: aye, and even through the whole of your political life. Let the State Churchman honestly read what the Free Churchman has to say for himself; and, reciprocally, let the Free Churchman and the Voluntary as honestly read what the State Churchman has to say for himself—Dr. Chalmers, for instance. Let the Anglican read the Puritan, and the Puritan the

Anglican, especially that greatest of all the Anglicans, Richard Hooker. And so on, through all your daily and weekly newspapers, and all your monthly and quarterly magazines. And then, in whatever way these debates and discussions may end, they will all end to your everlasting advantage. For you will have made a gain in Christian character that will abide with you for ever. And that because you will have come out of all these controversies and party conflicts wiser men than you were when you entered them: calmer-minded men, fairer-minded men, and more godly-minded men. And that, be well assured, is the divinely designed result in you of all these divisions and discussions and debates. Because all the churches, and all their ecclesiastical parties, as well as all the nations, and all their political parties, are all appointed and ordained of God not to be an end in themselves, but to be His appointed means of making all men to grow, amid all these things, in truth and in love. The full end and the final cause of all these things—as of everything else in this present life—is that faith, and hope, and truth, and love may be found, and may increase, and may abound, more and more, among men. And the greatest fruit of all these things is love. For God Himself is love; and he that loveth dwelleth in God, and God in him.

"When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion we were like them that dream. Then was our mouth filled with laughter and our tongue with singing. Then said they among the heathen, The Lord hath done great things for them. The Lord hath done great things for us, whereof we are glad. Turn again our captivity, O Lord, as the streams in the south." "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy. He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again

with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." And so will it be when God gives us the full and complete union of all His people in our fatherland. For then each several church will bring her own special sheaves to the great storehouse. The Church of Scotland will bring all her experiences, with all that she has learned, and all that she has attained to since her disruption. And the United Free Church will bring all her special experiences, and all her special attainments also. And when God's good time comes, all the other Presbyterian and other churches in Scotland will come again with rejoicing, bringing their sheaves also with them. And if ever the good time comes when the Episcopal Church of Scotland will arrive among us with her sheaves, that will be a very enriching addition to the common Scottish store of grace, and truth, and brotherly love. And then, "Who is this that looketh forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners? Enlarge the place of thy tent, and let them stretch forth the curtains of thine habitation: lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes. For thy seed shall inherit the Gentiles, and shall make the desolate cities to be inhabited."

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THE UNDENOMINATIONAL POLICY OF THE QUARTERLY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I congratulate you on the enlarged and improved form of THE QUARTERLY. Your magazine seems to me to fill a unique place in being perfectly undenominational while appealing to all denominations on the subject which concerns them all—the recovery of their lost unity. I highly appreciate the catholic spirit which pervades it, and feel that it is worthy of a large circulation. The idea of the new department—the Christian Unity Pulpit—is an excellent one; some of the most important utterances on the different aspects of the question are at present being made by leading preachers whose sermons often pass comparatively unnoticed by the ordinary press. Yours sincerely,

R. Dykes Shaw.

General Presbyterian Alliance, Edinburgh, Scotland.

QUARTERLY'S GOOD WORK

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I read with great interest THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY and feel constantly grateful for the good work which it is doing. Fraternally yours,

Boyd Vincent.

Cathedral House, Diocese of Southern Ohio, Cincinnati, Ohio.

FOSTERING HARMONY AND UNION

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— Permit me to express to you my cordial appreciation of the new form of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY. This magazine has served a most worthy cause in a notably efficient way, even in its former form, and the numbers have been of unfailing interest to me. In its new form it promises to be even better able to represent and foster the longing for harmony and union, which lives in the hearts of all believers in Jesus, the Saviour of the world, whose atonement is the all-sufficient ground for union, and of our eternal hope. May the Lord, our God, reward you by permitting you to rejoice with your fellow-believers in a glorious harvest, after you have been so faithfully and diligently active in sowing broadcast the heavenly seed of peace and union!

With the assurance of my deepest appreciation, I remain,

Very sincerely yours,

Karl A. Mueller.

Northern Province of the Moravian Church in America, Watertown, Wisconsin.

FREEDOM FROM RELIGIOUS BIGOTRY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— Among the forces and influences that are working to promote Christian unity among the Churches of Christ in America and

throughout the world to-day, I do not know of any more welcome and pleasing to those who read it, and more worthy of commendation to those who have not as yet become acquainted with it, than THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, published in Baltimore by the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity. Being an open forum for the free and frank discussion of all the phases, of the duties and difficulties, involved in the problem of modern Church union, it ought to appeal to a wide circle of churchmen, and especially to those who have caught the vision of the coming of the one world-wide Kingdom of the Divine-human Christ. In promoting Christian unity and endeavoring to bring together in greater love and fellowship of service the long severed branches of the Church of Christ, it follows the sane and wise method of seeking closer union through closer communion, and through a frank and brotherly interchange of opinion on all the points involved. The articles that have appeared in it since I became a reader of it have impressed me as being remarkably free from all sectarian narrowness and religious bigotry, although well nigh all the religious denominations are represented among those who write for it. The editorials in particular breathe the spirit of Christian fraternity and are marked by a genuine and generous catholicity that cannot fail to commend themselves to all who are looking and praying for the greater unity of the Church of Christ in this generation.

Very sincerely yours,
Wilbur F. Tillett.

Vanderbilt University School of Religion, Nashville, Tenn.

SANGUINE CONFIDENCE IN THE FUTURE

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— Need I say that THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is one of the most interesting and hopeful publications that reach my hands? Perhaps its most helpful note is that of sanguine confidence in the future—a note distinctive of the Transatlantic spiritual temperament, which it is most useful to send echoing back to this old and undefeated, but rather weary, land. Believe me,

Yours always truly,
Archibald Fleming.

The Manse, St. Columba's, London, England.

DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I have found THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY interesting and informing. Of course you will realize that your "perspective" is rather different from ours in Presbyterian Scotland. This explains why to me many of your contributors are sometimes scarcely intelligible. They lay emphasis on what to me appear to be matters of slight importance, and they use words sometimes in a sense not easily understood. Some writers also seem confused in their thinking. They are vaguely in love with "unity," "union," "unification," when they really appear to desire "uniformity." Then, too, there is a rather careless use of such terms as "sects," "divisions," "separations," "divided Christendom" and the like. And I particularly dislike the use of the term "communions" as applied to the different "branches" of what to me is the one "catholic" or "universal" *Church*. There should be but one "communion" among all who love and serve Jesus Christ as Lord. It is peculiarly repellent to me to think of different "communions" among those who profess and call themselves Christians. And when this term is employed to avoid or evade the use of the term

"Church" with the hidden implication that some of these "communions" are not entitled to the name "Church" at all, it is still more abhorrent. What is needed as an indispensable preliminary for the proper realization of a true Christian unity among all bodies of Christians is that these bodies shall cease to "unchurch" one another, and shall frankly recognize one another as "churches," i.e., as "branches" of the one Catholic Church. It is largely this "unchurching" which has caused the antagonisms and suspicions and prejudices and uncharitable judgments which constitute the scandal of "divided Christendom." If this "unchurching" were abandoned, minor differences would soon cease to "divide." First, let Christians "agree to differ," and before long they will begin to "agree to agree."

One thing more. May I suggest that you hold a symposium on the real meaning of our Lord's Prayer for the "one"-ness of His people in John XVII? Constantly certain writers *assume* that what our Lord meant was a visible, physical, organic one-ness like that of an empire or hierarchy. To me it is evident that this *could not* be His meaning. Otherwise He could never have compared the unity of believers to the *unity subsisting between Himself and His Father.* Cf. verse 22—"that they may all be one *even as We are one.*" The Father and the Son in the Blessed Trinity are "one" certainly, but they remain also "two," for Jesus speaks of "I" and "Thou" and "Us." Define the sense in which Father and Son are "one," and you will then be in a position to define the nature of the "one-ness" of Christians with each other for which Jesus prayed. "As Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee"—that points to a union or unity of Spirit, and cannot in the remotest way suggest a big, cumbrous, unwieldy, hierarchical "organization" or visible institution graduated and articulated by offices and administrations in the vain attempt to secure that the management or government shall be in the hands of one man, call him Pope or Presbyter or what you will. Such an " institution" is an impracticable dream; and even were it practicable, it would be far removed from Christ's conception of His "Church."

I have set down these suggestions just to show you how a Scottish Presbyterian who "unchurches" no "branch" of the Christian Church looks at the matter. I recognize more or less of error and more or less of truth and of earnestness in all the "churches," but I am ready to hold "communion" with all who acknowledge Jesus Christ as Lord and Saviour, however much they and I may differ on questions of "dogma" or polity or "orders."

In so far as you and your contributors are working for the spirit of unity and brotherly love among all Christians, I wish you God-speed; and I gladly express my appreciation of your efforts.

Believe me,

Sincerely yours,

Robert Forgan.

United Free Church of Scotland, Aberdeen, Scotland.

CONSTRUCTIVE CRITICISMS

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— Will you permit me to congratulate you upon the efforts you are making on behalf of Christian unity, and to assist you by making one or two constructive criticisms? I have read THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY with interest for many years and have been profoundly impressed by the evidently sincere desire on the part of your editorial board and your many contributors for the fulfilment of Christ's prayer that we may all be one. But as I have some very deep

convictions of my own in regard to the historic character of the church I have served for twenty-eight years, I am sometimes irritated by the attitude which is taken by denominationalism towards the Episcopal Church.

We are almost invariably treated as one of the many Protestant sects of Reformation or post-Reformation origin, and are usually classified with Protestantism rather than Catholicism; whereas, as our Prayer Book plainly shows, we are in doctrine, discipline and polity aligned with Catholicism rather than Protestantism. We, therefore, ask you to remember that the religious world is not divided into Roman Catholic and Protestant, but into Catholic and Protestant, and that the Catholic Church is divided into three great branches—the Greek, which is the mother of all churches, the Roman, and the Anglican, to which we belong. If I were not sure that my church were part of the great historic Catholic Church I would make my submission to the See of Rome within the next week!

Then again, if this well-intentioned desire for Christian unity is to result in anything, we must all try to grasp the undeniable fact that Protestantism has surrendered much of apostolic and primitive Christianity, whilst some parts of Catholicism have added to it. To me it has seemed as if the self-complacency of Protestantism—this unwillingness to get acquainted with itself, and to know what it has wrongfully surrendered—is the first weakness to be overcome. I have always been taught to regard the Church as a Divine thing—the Bride, the Body of Christ. But Protestantism seems to have lost such a conception. When I talk to members of the denominations about the Church as existing before the Bible they look bewildered, for the thought is entirely new to them. They seem to know nothing about tradition or the unbroken practises of the Church for nineteen centuries, but turn to the Bible for specific commands, and if they fail to find them there conclude that such practises are altogether unwarranted.

Let me suggest two or three ways in which your noble work might be stimulated.

First, try to encourage an observance of the Church Year. It seems pitiful that the great days in the life of our Lord, which the Church has commemorated from the beginning, should be so generally ignored by denominationalism. Christmas is observed on the Sunday before, or after, seldom on the 25th of December. Good Friday is ignored, although it is the world's great day of Atonement. Lent is ridiculed as a general thing, although hallowed by the undivided Church for centuries. What a step towards Christian unity it would be if the different denominations would resolve to observe the chief days in our Lord's life as well as the chief days in the life of the nation!

Second, you might contribute materially towards Christian unity if you were to educate the people against these so-called revivals which in this part of the country are a menace to our Christianity. Revivals are necessary. The spiritual life needs to be revived and revived again and again. But it is tragic to see so many Christian people depending upon them for the maintenance and the resuscitation of their religious life! In this city of sixty thousand people there is hardly a week in the year without a revival of some kind in our midst. They have come to be regarded as necessary for the normal development of the spiritual life. We have our two seasons for revival—Advent and Lent—consecrated by many centuries, and we have little sympathy for these many religious adventures which are being made unceasingly in the Middle West. And having made the closest kind of investigation we are reluctantly compelled to say that we have seen very few good results from even the best. In one instance, cards were sent me and one man assured me that he had been converted. When I spoke of the necessity of baptism and church

attendance, he assured me that he could be a Christian without these! And my experience has been that of most of our clergy.

Third, would it not be well for your many readers to know precisely where you stand on the subject of marriage and divorce? My own city is becoming another Reno. More divorces are granted here than in any city of its size that I am acquainted with. And there are always to be found certain ministers who, for the petty fee, will willingly marry those who are divorced! This is simply a question of morals, and it makes one righteously indignant to see ministers of religion degrading themselves and their religion by their pious contribution to the destruction of our home life.

Again let me ask your pardon for this brutal frankness, but then one cannot make an omelet without breaking eggs! Personally I would rejoice to see my own church make some definite contribution to Christian unity by a willingness to surrender certain things which are not essential to those of our faith. But denominationalism must be educated by a study of primitive Christianity to distinguish between what is essential and what is not essential, and must be willing to receive again, and to use, those things which were so unwisely surrendered in the ages of the past. Federation, in my judgment, is a temporary makeshift, and one to which we ourselves cannot agree. Unity—corporate unity—is the only solution of the great problem, and we pray God to bless your efforts to accomplish it!

Most sincerely yours,
Percy T. Fenn.

The Rectory, St. John's Church, Wichita, Kansas.

(The editor's position on marriage and divorce is clearly presented in his recent book "Working With God or The Story of a Twenty-five Year Pastorate in Baltimore," Chapter XII, $1.50. Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md.—The Editor.)

READ WITH INTEREST

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— Your valuable magazine, THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, comes to my hand regularly and each time I read it with great interest. Thank you for what it brings.

Yours truly,
Judge S. T. Fujita.

Yokohama, Japan.

READ WITH PLEASURE

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I read with pleasure THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Archbishop of Armagh.

The Palace, Armagh, Ireland.

UNION OF NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES IN AUSTRALIA

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— It may interest you to know that an earnest effort is being made just now in Australia to bring about a union of the non-Episcopal churches. The chief courts of the Australian Presbyterian, Congregational and Methodist Churches which have recently met, all appointed committees to consult, with a view of submitting a basis of union to the state conferences and minor courts. It is hoped that other churches may do the same, and that thus by the blessing of God Church union may be advanced.

As the South Australian Methodist representative on the Central Union Committee, I shall eagerly look to the United States of America and Canada to see what progress you are making in the direction of closer federation with a view to an ultimate union.

May I say that I much appreciate THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

I am,

Yours sincerely,

George Hall.

South Australian Conference, Riverton, S. Australia.

LUTHERAN UNION IN AMERICA

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— The Rt. Rev. Nathan Söderblom, Lutheran Archbishop of Sweden, has just transmitted to me through Secretary of State Lansing, a message calling upon the various branches of the Lutheran Church in the United States to commemorate this Quadricentennial year of the Reformation by holding a General Lutheran Conference, with a view to the unification of the whole Lutheran Church in America, which is an item that I thought would interest you.

A word regarding THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY. It seeks to promote the union of Christendom, not by visionary or radical means, but by judicious, wise and helpful methods. The spirit that breathes through its pages is not alone Christian but churchly. Difficult as is the realization of its aim, it is an ideal which we should ever keep before us. And in doing this with such marked ability, wisdom and charity, THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY fills an important place in the progress of the Kingdom of God.

Yours sincerely,

Junius B. Remensnyder.

St. James' Lutheran Church, New York City.

THE CHRISTIAN SPIRIT OF DISCUSSION

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY reaches me regularly and I am much pleased with its contents, especially for the kindly and Christian spirit of discussion exuding from all its pages. May God guide and bless you in your good work of faith and love in the line of seeking to advance the cause of Christian unity, prays

Your faithful and grateful brother,

Dan'l S. Tuttle.

The Bishop's House, St. Louis, Missouri.

UNITY OF FORCES NECESSARY TO VICTORY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— In this terrible war we have had impressed upon us the principle that there must be the coöperation of many forces and the coördination of different parts in one great whole under one comprehensive plan if the Allied Nations wish to win the battle for the freedom of the world and to establish a righteous and an abiding peace upon earth. The utter folly of each nation attempting to fight independently is clearly seen, and so that various organized churches must surely soon awake to the realization of the utter folly of their independent efforts and the imperative need that there is for the coöperation of many forces and the coördination of different parts in

one great whole under one comprehensive plan, if the world is ever to be won for Christ and the kingdom of God established upon earth.

To win the battle for freedom it is not necessary or desirable that the Allies should be merged into one nation; and so to win the world for Christ it is not essential that the many spiritual forces should be pressed into one mold, but there must be not only the coöperation of many forces—this alone is not sufficient—there must also be the coördination of different parts in one whole under one comprehensive plan. The Spirit of Christ will in time bring about this coöperation if in all things we give the chief place to the spirit of Christ; and the Headship of Christ will in time bring about this coördination of different parts, if in all things we bow to His Leadership. "We being many are one Body in Christ."

I want to say that I appreciate most highly THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Yours faithfully,

F. H. Du Vernet.

Metropolitan of British Columbia, Prince Rupert, B. C.

WAR CONDITIONS FORCING UNITY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I am most interested in the problem of Christian unity and especially appreciated Dr. Tillett's article in the April number of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, entitled "Denominational Disarmament, Christian Unity and World Peace." Would you give me authority to try and get it reproduced in one of our good religious journals, or to have it reprinted in pamphlet form? It is a most appropriate bit of writing in view of unity proposals now before the country, including those for an United Free Church of England. The war now is forcing the churches more together. The Life and Liberty Movement in the Church of England is a good omen; also the presence of the Bishop of London in the Wesleyan Conference.

Yours faithfully,

Arthur Black.

Shaftesbury Society and Ragged School Union, London, England.

ACCOMPLISHES A GREAT DEAL OF GOOD

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY has been coming to me regularly and I have read it with great interest and profit. I am sure it accomplishes a great deal of good in the realization of its purpose.

Most sincerely yours,

John G. Murray.

Bishop's House, Diocese of Maryland, Baltimore.

PROTESTANTISM IN THE FIRE

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I am very much interested in the interest of Church unity. As yet I cannot see clear through to the end. But I do believe that Protestantism is in the fire. Before the Lord is through with us I feel that all may be melted down again into the pure gold and shaped into a new mold and one that more nearly comes to the ideal. In the meantime I am glad that Christians of all denominations are wanting to be brothers in Christ and that we are coming together for practical purposes.

Cordially yours,

Hezekiah L. Pyle.

First Congregational Church, Philadelphia, Pa.

COMING TO THE SAME END FROM DIFFERENT HEREDITARY ENVIRONMENT

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY comes to me with perfect regularity, and I should miss it greatly if it were to fail. Not only do I appreciate its articles in themselves, but also they are instructive to me in a preëminent fashion as coming from those who are aiming at the same end from the standpoint of a different hereditary environment. I am particularly pleased with the last number.

Very sincerely yours,
J. T. F. Farquhar.

Episcopal Church, Fochabers, Scotland.

UNITY WITHOUT UNIFORMITY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I appreciate THE QUARTERLY, which comes to me regularly. As to the manner in which unity is to be effected there must be a variety of opinions. My own opinion is that, here in England there is no chance of carrying any scheme that involves interference with the autonomy of the different sections of the church. I have read Dr. Macfarland's article in the last number of THE QUARTERLY on "The Progress of Federation Among the Churches," and find myself in hearty agreement with much it contains, as, for instance, "Federal unity recognizes that the Kingdom of God does not mean solitariness on the one hand or uniform consolidation on the other."

The attempt to enforce uniformity has led to some of the greatest divisions recorded in Church history. I have been studying closely the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, as I am writing the history of the Wesleyan Methodist Church, and I have seen the danger of insisting upon uniform ways of belief, worship and government. Liberty in these matters acts as a safety-valve. If that liberty cannot be obtained in a national church, such as ours, then we find it outside in other churches in which the form of belief and government is in accordance with our convictions. The right to separate from a church which does not express our religious convictions, must not be sacrificed to any scheme of ecclesiastical uniformity.

As for myself, I see good in all sections of the Church and much to admire in each of them. Like John Wesley, I am "the friend of all, the enemy of none;" and all through my ministerial life I have helped other churches as well as my own. Faithfully yours,

J. S. Simon.

Wesleyan Methodist Conference, Birkdale, Southport, England.

CHRISTIAN UNITY DEAR TO ALL BELIEVERS

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I write particularly to express the pleasure I have had in reading your editorial on the "Untrodden Paths of Unity" in THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY for July. It is a wise word and one "fitly spoken." I take this occasion to express the great satisfaction I have in reading THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY as it appears from time to time upon my table. You are rendering a most important service to the cause of Christian unity, which is dear to your heart and mine, as it should be to every disciple of Christ.

Very sincerely,
Geo. B. Stewart.

President's Office, Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, New York.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE UNION OF CHRISTIAN FORCES IN AMERICA. By ROBERT A. ASHWORTH, D.D., Pastor of the First Baptist Church, Milwaukee, Wis.; Member of the Executive Committee of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. A Prize Book. Philadelphia: American Sunday-School Union. 266 pages. 75 cents net.

THERE are few books dealing with the problem of Christian unity that are more sane and helpful than this informing volume, which won the thousand dollar prize of the American Sunday-School Union in a competition for the best manuscript on the subject of Christian unity. Dr. Ashworth has not been afraid to think and has laid bare conditions in the Church for which there can be no apology other than genuine repentance. He affirms that the worst enemies of the Church are its own household and proves his assertion in revealing the expense and waste caused by Christian disunion. "There is no single characteristic of organized Christianity which has not served as a cause of division." In matters of polity, divisions have occurred over the congregational, presbyterial and episcopal systems, and these have had their subdivisions all amid the bitterest controversies. The Roman Catholic Church admits the validity of the orders of the Greek Orthodox Church, but there is no fellowship between them. Both the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Churches deny the validity of the orders of the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal Church, which in turn deny the validity of the orders of all Protestant bodies, it likewise being so with the ordinances. No experience in the Church could be more sacred than the Lord's Supper, designed to be the mark of unity; yet this has been the occasion and cause of division. This disunion threatens to bankrupt the resources of the Church, while organized Christianity has suffered irreparably from the loss of spiritual fellowship as well as in national and local prestige and leadership.

The prayer of Jesus was for the oneness among the disciples like that He enjoyed with the Father, and the most convincing Christian apologetic of these times is a Christian community in love, for factious and contentious spirits belie the presence of Christ. Facing the magnitude of the missionary task at home and abroad, there has come a despair of success except through the united efforts of a united Church. They who pray "Thy Kingdom come," are forced to pray for the servants of the Kingdom, "that they may all be one." There is no future for a divided Church. Said John R. Mott, "An unbelieving world is the price we are paying for a divided Christianity."

There is some encouragement in the passing of the sectarian spirit. It must go, for, as said Professor A. B. Bruce, "to be enthusiastic about the Church in its present condition is impossible." But every effective

step for its unity will be enough, said Mr. Gladstone, "to lead any man to lay down his head and die contentedly." There are many evidences of the growth of unity and Dr. Ashworth regards the largest contribution that any man can make to this cause to be the promotion of mutual acquaintance, understanding and appreciation among the divided communions of Christendom. He wisely suggests in the seminary curriculum a course on comparative denominationalism. We would find ourselves much more closely in agreement with other bodies if we understood them. Our ignorance of others is both curious and sad. Modern scholarship as applied to the study of the Bible makes strongly for Christian unity. There is already a unity of Christian scholarship, a devotional unity as revealed in the great hymns, an ethical unity as manifested in practical coöperation, and a unity in the conception of the fundamental aim and purpose of the Church. But the greatest hindrance to unity is the lack of the Christ spirit —"Beloved, let us love one another; for God is love."

He shows the place of federation in the programme of unity, the value of the unity of Christian forces in the country and village, coöperation in the home and foreign fields, and the necessary step of a united Protestantism before we can expect to properly approach the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox Churches. "The Christian Church in China" bids fair to unify, before very long, all the stronger Protestant forces of that republic. What is being done there is only an instance of what is going on in other fields, until there shall be a united Christendom.

The last chapter, dealing with the basis of organic unity, is a fitting close to this interesting volume. It argues for a return to Christ, back to the first century for the living springs at which the earliest Christians drank. "The basis of unity that sufficed for the first disciples is the only basis that can serve the twentieth century." The whole book is so thoroughly readable and sane that one cannot help but be impressed with the timeliness of its message. He closes the volume with this finely said sentence: "When Christians desire it earnestly enough, desire it more than they desire a hundred and one other things which are incompatible with it, desire it passionately, the lost secret of Christian unity will be discovered again, and the prayer of the Lord of the Church that His disciples may be one will be fulfilled."

A GUIDE TO THE STUDY OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. By William Herbert Perry Faunce, Shailer Mathews, J. M. Powis Smith, Ernest DeWitt Burton, Edgar Johnson Goodspeed, Shirley Jackson Case, Francis Albert Christie, George Cross, Errett Gates, Gerald Birney Smith, Theodore Gerald Soares, Charles Richmond Henderson, and George Burman Foster. Edited by Gerald Birney Smith. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 759 pages. $3.00 net.

This volume sets forth very satisfactorily how a modern divinity school is attempting to meet the demands of these times. Years ago we had

Crooks and Hunt's *Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology,* Cave's *Introduction to Theology and Its Literature* and Schaff's *Theological Propædeutic.* But in the last two decades some important phases of modern theological education have undergone such changes that this work must receive a cordial welcome. Because of the advancement in specialization, making it quite impossible for one man, however broad-minded in his scholarship, to cover the whole survey, this book has thirteen contributors, whose names insure confidence in the fields which are discussed. It is a valuable guide to the study of the Christian religion for Protestants, furnishing a guide to ministers who desire to keep in touch with the results of the latest scholarship.

MARY SLESSOR OF CALABAR, Pioneer Missionary. By W. P. Livingstone, Editor of the Record of the United Free Church of Scotland, Author of "Black Jamaica" and "The Race Conflict." Seventh Edition. New York and London: Hodder and Stoughton. 347 pages. $1.50 net.

"It was the dream of my girlhood to be a missionary to Calabar," said Mary Slessor, who, from a factory girl, working from six o'clock in the morning to six in the evening, and living in a home of poverty and cruelty in consequence of a dissipated father, became one of the greatest missionaries in modern times. The data for this story were prepared in part by herself on solicitation from her friends, hoping it would stimulate and strengthen the faith of the supporters of the work, but she died before the data had been put into permanent form by herself. Chiefly from her own letters it has been possible to piece together the main facts of her wonderful story, which Mr. Livingstone has told with such fascination that not only is one's interest awakened in Calabar and this beautiful life in the African bush, but it is an unusual contribution to the whole missionary enterprise of the Church. What a book to put into the hands of young people, when their minds are just awakening in looking out upon life's task! This book has a place and many will peruse its pages with thrilling interest and stimulating profit.

A HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION. By Elias B. Sanford, D.D., Honorary Secretary of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Hartford, Conn: The S. S. Scranton Company. 287 pages. $1.25 net.

On the occasion of the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation, no book bears so pertinent a message as this interesting volume from Dr. Sanford, who has written frequently on the unity of the Church. The story of the Protestant Reformation is finely told, emphasizing again those principles which are so necessary for Christian democracy and Christian unity. He shows that the struggle between democracy and autocracy still goes on, but autocracy must be discarded by the common progress of human affairs if foundations are to be laid upon which to build a perma-

nent civilization. All those days of storm and uncertainty were fraught with hope of better times, when unity would be found in a simpler faith, and so Dr. Sanford's closing sentence lifts the vision to the ultimate consummation: "With gratitude to Almighty God millions of Christian communicants, connected with Protestant evangelical churches, recall the names of their heroic founders; but there is a Name above every Name, in whose presence all earthly leaders bow with penitent, obedient, trusting hearts. Above the tumult of strifes that so often, in centuries past, has divided the Church, of which Christ is the Head, may we not hope and believe that this Twentieth Century of the Christian era shall rejoice in the answer to our Saviour's prayer as He entered the path that led through Gethsemane to the Cross—and then to the morning of the Resurrection and the Day of Pentecost—'that they may all be one; even as thou Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us; that the world may believe that thou didst send me.'"

RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS. Book I: The Record of Mt-Mk-Lk. Book II: The Record of John. By HENRY BURTON SHARMAN, PH.D. New York. George H. Doran Co. 319 pages. $2.50, net.

THE New Testament student will hail this book with the most cordial welcome. It harmonizes the synoptic Gospels in a new setting, while the Gospel of John is given by itself with the fullest possible cross reference to the synoptics. It classifies the records in the life of Jesus in twenty-four chapters. Some of these are Development of Opposition to Jesus, Contemporary Opinions About the Worth of Jesus, Tour of the Disciples and Resultant Events, Discourse on Events of the Future, etc. Dr. Sharman describes the book as "a super-harmony of the Gospels." There is no attempt in this scholarly work to dislocate any passage, but by printing consecutive passages in Roman type it permits the continuous reading of each Gospel, while passages that are similar are given in footnotes, making the whole work so thorough and satisfying that it will not only save time to the busy student, but will furnish suggestion to a larger and more constructive study of the life of Jesus. While its aim in setting forth the material is for an historical rather than a critical knowledge of the records, the literary phenomena of the records have been so exhibited as to provide the basis for somewhat thorough critical study of the source of relationships of these records. It is a book that the student will revel in to great profit.

FAIRHOPE. THE ANNALS OF A COUNTRY CHURCH. By EDGAR DEWITT JONES. Frontispiece by Herbert Deland Williams. New York: The Macmillan Company. Illustrated. 212 pages. $1.25.

WITH skill Dr. Jones, in fourteen chapters, tells the annals of a country church with so much humanness and charm that one is impelled to complete the reading before closing the book. The types of human nature are presented so cleverly that the reader becomes an artist, dressing up the scenes into life from the vividness of the pen pictures. It is one of those books that will live because of its real worth in story life.

CB

VOL. VII NO. 3

"The greatest need of our generation is that of apostles of reconciliation."—JOHN R. MOTT.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Edited by PETER AINSLIE

MANY Christians in looking upon Christians in other communions are like a man traveling in foggy weather. Those at a distance on every side appear to be wrapped in the fog, while near him the atmosphere appears clear, although he is as much in the fog as any that he sees around him. The most difficult task in our approach to Christian unity is the discovery of our own errors.

JANUARY, 1918

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY
Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

AGENTS:
Christian Board of Publication, *St. Louis*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4.*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Peace in the Divided Church of Christ. It is issued in January, April, July and October.

Edited by PETER AINSLIE

Vol. VII. JANUARY, 1918 No. 3

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:

THE POWER OF THE DIVINE PLAN 9

STEPS TOWARDS REUNION. ARTHUR C. A. HALL 16

HISTORIC EFFORTS IN BEHALF OF CONCILIATION AND PRESENT STATUS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY. F. D. KERSHNER 19

TRUTH, FREEDOM, PROGRESS, UNITY—IDEALS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION. C. MOXON 36

THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT. JULIUS H. HORSTMANN 40

MARTIN LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION. GEORGE WILLIAM DOUGLAS 49

NOTES AND COMMENTS 60

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 67

BOOK REVIEWS 75

THIS JOURNAL IS PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY and is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its readers are in all Communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Frederick Courtney, office, 143 E. 37th St., New York. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Sir Richard Stapley; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson, Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North, Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford, Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

SWANWICK FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, 17 Palace Road, Crouch End, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity

Inc.

(Having its Inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell a Presbyterian Minister of Washington, Pa., 1809)

An Organization of Disciples of Christ

PURPOSE OF THE ASSOCIATION: To watch for every indication of Christian unity and to hasten the time, by intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith."

> Ινα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, πάτήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.
>
> Ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu Pater in me, et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint, ut credat mundus, quia tu me misisti.
>
> *That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*

CONDITION OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE ASSOCIATION: Sympathy with the work of Christian unity, expressed in prayer and coöperation, irrespective of Church affiliation, and the payment of not less than $2.50 for annual membership fee, payment preferably in January. Those paying less are counted contributors, but not members.

COMMISSIONERS: Peter Ainslie, D.D., LL.D., President, Baltimore, Md.; Carey E. Morgan, M.A., Vice-President, Nashville, Tenn.; F. D. Kershner, M.A., LL.D., Secretary, Cincinnati, Ohio; H. C. Armstrong, M.A., B.D., Baltimore, Md.; E. B. Bagby, M.A., B.D., Washington, D. C.; F. W. Burnham, LL.D., Cincinnati, Ohio; I. S. Chenoweth, M.A., Philadelphia, Pa.; Finis S. Idleman, D.D., New York, N. Y.; Z. T. Sweeney, LL.D., Columbus, Ind.; B. A. Abbott, B.A., St. Louis, Mo.; E. M. Bowman, Esq., New York, N. Y.; C. M. Chilton, D.D., St. Joseph, Mo.; J. H. Garrison, M.A., LL.D., Claremont, Cal.; J. H. Goldner, B.A., Cleveland, Ohio; F. A. Henry M.A., LL.B., Cleveland, Ohio; T. C. Howe, Ph.D., Indianapolis, Ind.; W. P. Lipscomb, Esq., Washington, D. C.; R. A. Long, Esq., Kansas City, Mo.; C. S. Medbury, D.D., Des Moines, Ia.; C. C. Morrison B.A., Chicago, Ill.; W. C. Pearce, Esq., Chicago, Ill.; A. B. Philputt, D.D., LL.D., Indianapolis, Ind.; E. L. Powell, LL.D., Louisville, Ky.; W. F. Richardson, M.A., LL.D., Los Angeles, Cal.; I. J. Spencer, M.A., LL.D., Lexington, Ky.

WORK OF THE ASSOCIATION: The Commission of the Association is simply the Executive Committee of twenty-five members, nine of whom are the Committee on Direction, dealing with such problems as may come before the Association for action between the annual meetings. It is proposed to use this Commission under four divisions: namely, Commission on Christian Unity, dealing with Christian unity in general; Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order; Commission on Federation; and Commission on International Friendship. To all these subjects the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity has spoken. The Association publishes *The Christian Union Quarterly.*

For further particulars, address

Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity

PETER AINSLIE, President

Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

Bibliography of Christian Unity

THE BOOKS included in this list are by Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Congregationalists, Unitarians, Lutherans, Baptists, Disciples of Christ, etc.

CHRISTIAN UNION, Van Dyke, Appleton, 1885 ..... $1.00
CHRISTIAN UNION, Garrison, St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1906 ..... 1.00
CHRISTIAN UNION IN EFFORT, Firth, Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1911.. 1.50
CHRISTIAN UNION IN SOCIAL SERVICE, Carlile, London, Clarke & Co., 1913 ..... 2/6
CHRISTIAN UNITY, Briggs, Scribner, 1900 ..... 1.00
CHRISTIAN UNITY AT WORK, Macfarland, Federal Council 1.00
CHURCH DIVISIONS AND CHRISTIANITY, Grane, Macmillan, 1916.... 2.00
HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS ADVOCATING CHRISTIAN UNION, Young, Chicago, The Christian Century Co., 1904 ..... 1.00
HOW TO PROMOTE CHRISTIAN UNION, Kershner, Cincinnati, The Standard Publishing Co., 1916 ..... 1.00
LECTURES ON THE REUNION OF THE CHURCH, Döllinger, Dodd, 1872 1.50
OUR PLEA FOR UNION AND THE PRESENT CRISIS, Willett, Chicago, Christian Century Co. ..... .50
PASSING PROTESTANTISM AND COMING CATHOLICISM, Smyth, Scribner, 1908 ..... 1.00
RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD, London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1908 .....
RESTATEMENT AND REUNION, Streeter, Macmillan, 1914 ..... .75
SOME THOUGHTS OF CHRISTIAN REUNION, Carpenter, Macmillan, 1895 ..... 1.25
SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF UNITY IN CHRISTENDOM, Tarner, London, Elliott Stock, 1895 .....
THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, Wells, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905.... .75
THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, Whyte, Armstrong, 1907 ..... .25
THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, Campbell, St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1890 ..... 1.00
THE CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS UNITY, Kelly, Longmans, 1913..... 1.50
THE CHURCHES OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL, Macfarland, Revell.... 1.00
THE LARGER CHURCH, Lanier, Fredericksburg, Va. 1.25
THE LEVEL PLAN FOR CHURCH UNION, Brown, Whittaker, 1910..... 1.50
THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Cobb, Crowell, 1915..... 1.25
THE MESSAGE OF THE DISCIPLES FOR THE UNION OF THE CHURCH, Ainslie, Revell, 1913 ..... 1.00
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS SECTS, McComas, Revell, 1912.... 1.25
THE SEVENFOLD UNITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Hall, Longmans, 1911 ..... .75
THE UNION OF CHRISTIAN FORCES IN AMERICA, Ashworth, Philadelphia. American Sunday-School Union, 1915 ..... .75
THE UNITED CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES, Shields, Scribner, 1895 ..... 2.50
THOUGHTS OF THE PRESENT POSITION OF PROTESTANTISM, Harnack, Macmillan, 1899 ..... 1.00
UNITY AND MISSIONS, Brown, Revell, 1915 ..... 1.50
WHAT MUST THE CHURCH DO TO BE SAVED? Simms, Revell, 1913.. 1.50

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

A World Conference on Faith and Order, time and place not yet named.

At the instance of the Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order of the Protestant Episcopal Church, request is made that all who have been baptized into the name of Christ observe the eight days beginning January 18th through the 25th, 1918 (January 5th-12th in the calendar of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Churches) as a season for special prayer for the reunion of Christendom and for the blessing and the guidance of all efforts to that end, including especially the attempt to be made in the World Conference on Faith and Order to bring Christians to such an understanding and appreciation of each other that the way may be opened for increased effort in the way of constructive work for reunion.

At the instance of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Pentecost Sunday has been named primarily as the day for special sermons on Christian unity in all Churches, along with prayers to that end.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

ARTHUR C. A. HALL

is the Protestant Episcopal bishop of Vermont. He is an Englishman by birth and was educated at Oxford. He took orders in the Church of England and was licensed to preach in the Diocese of Oxford as a member of the Society of St. John the Evangelist (Crowley Fathers). He came to America in 1874, serving in Boston until 1894, when he was consecrated bishop. He is a voluminous writer, being the author of more than two dozen volumes. Among them are: *The Work of the Holy Spirit, The Sevenfold Units of the Christian Church, Christian Unity,* etc.

F. D. KERSHNER,

Doctor of Laws, is an educator, author and newspaper correspondent. He was formerly the president of Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, and until recently was the editor-in-chief of *The Christian-Evangelist,* St. Louis, Mo. He is the author of *The Religion of Christ, How to Promote Christian Union* and *Christian Baptism.* This last named book is a brochure, which was read before the Christian Unity Foundation of the Protestant Episcopal Church, New York.

CAVENDISH MOXON

is the Honorary Secretary of the Churchmen's Union for the advancement of liberal religious thought and Hon. Business Manager of its monthly organ, *The Modern Churchman.* He was educated at Christ Church, Oxford, and Ripon Clergy College, and is at present the rector of Marske, Richmond, Yorkshire, England.

J. H. HORSTMANN

is the editor of *The Evangelical Herald,* St. Louis, Mo., and is the author of a series of handbooks entitled *Evangelical Fundamentals,* one volume of which deals with the subject of Christian unity from the standpoint of the Evangelical Union, proclaimed in Germany one hundred years ago by King Frederick William III. of Prussia on the occasion of the third centenary of the Reformation. It is a movement entirely independent of the state church and stands first of all for unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace without any sort of organic union.

GEORGE WILLIAM DOUGLAS,

Doctor of Divinity, has served as rector of St. John's Church, Washington, Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn., etc., and has been senior canon of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, New York, since 1904. He is examining chaplain, being chairman of the board, for the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York, and is the author of *Hints to Sunday School Teachers, Prayers for Children,* etc., and a magazine contributor.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Greek, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

MEDITATION:

"On our great mission field of China there are a million of Christian folk, one in Christian faith, with a rising sense of national unity, who look to you with gratitude as those from whom the Gospel came to them. If you will stand by them, and help to win all China for the Kingdom of God, they will be your fellow-workers and hold you in love and honor. But they will not long be content to have the Church of Christ in China split into fragments because we have been divided among ourselves in the West. If we give them cause to suspect us of propagating our divisions among them, or, still worse, of keeping our own converts isolated that we may the more easily control them—of practising on them the policy of 'divide and dominate'—then, I fear, our influence over them for good will soon pass away. They will break off from our restraints, and make short work of our divisions. If they find us unworthy to lead them into the greatness of their Christian heritage, they may choose, as the lesser of two evils, to face the future without us, and with all their immaturity of Christian character and experience, solve their problems in their own way. In that perilous path they will lose the rich, historical experience of the older Churches of the West, which we, had we been more generous and more faithful, might have enabled them to share."—*J. Campbell Gibson, D.D.*

PENITENCE:

For acquiescence in the unhappy divisions of the Church of Christ.
For looking for the errors in another's position rather than the truth.
For aloofness from other Christians because they are not of the same communion as our own.

SUGGESTIONS FOR PRAYER

That we may rediscover for ourselves the great liberties and verities of our common faith until we are able to see that all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity are our brothers.
That we may so guard our conversation that we may learn to speak kindly of all Christians, remembering we are in the presence of One who is making record of our words.

UNITY AND UNION

UNITY we have and rejoice in: for UNION we pray and work. Unity is that which holds together persons and things which are dissimilar, so that there is a unity of mankind, and unity of nature. The unity of the Christian Church is due to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, who holds together in one all the dissimilar individuals and organizations which profess and call themselves Christian.

UNION is "the outward and visible sign of this inward and spiritual grace," and its restoration is as important and necessary for the well-being of the Church and the accomplishment of its work in the world as that of the United States was felt to be when blood and treasure were generously and eagerly poured forth to restore the union of the nation.

—FREDERICK COURTNEY, *New York City.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Vol. VII. JANUARY, 1918 No. 3

EDITORIAL

THE POWER OF THE DIVINE PLAN

The most essential condition for the advance of the Church of Jesus Christ on earth is unity. It is not an impossible ideal, but is in perfect keeping with the spiritual growth of religion. Differences that were great a century ago in many instances have almost faded out entirely. There are great barriers still. These, however, must be met in the spirit of courtesy, frankness and love. Just as there is no heart too stubborn for the triumph of the religion of Christ in that heart, so there is no condition in the Church so stubborn but the religion of Christ can master it for the unity of His flock.

The year 1910 marked a distinct epoch in this problem. That year the Christian Unity Foundation of the Protestant Episcopal Church was organized for the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference; also that year a Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order was appointed in the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church; also that year the Association for the promotion of Christian Unity, an organization of the Disciples of Christ, had its beginning. Likewise the Church of England in Australia appointed a commission dealing with

this problem. There were already in existence other organizations and commissions and committees, but that year a significant emphasis was placed upon Christian unity, each body acting without the knowledge of the other, indicating that there was a sympathetic force in operation unobservable to those that were acting.

The chief feature of this epoch was that in the future we would approach each other not by debate but by conference. For centuries we have sought to prove that the other fellow is absolutely wrong and that we are absolutely right. In this policy we have sought to build up denominational fences and make the divisions hard and fast, but the human mind in its wider educational facilities has been leaping over these fences and beholding with satisfaction Christian growth in other fields than its own. The religion of the future is to be the religion of the spirit. Consequently the attitude of the spirit is of primary importance in our approach to questions dealing with the unity of the Church of God. The plan of sitting around the table in conference and seeking wherein we agree and explaining at first-hand wherein we differ, without entering into controversy, has done much to clear the atmosphere and give liberty to the spirit.

The two great principles laid down by Jesus are, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." But this is only one. That which balances the declaration is, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

We have fought many battles over the divinity of Christ, and frequently have done it at the sacrifice of brotherhood among believers. In other words, we have been guilty of the folly of trying to sustain one proposition by tearing down the other, which made imperfect the sustaining of the first proposition. Whereas to tear down the second of these principles by unbrotherly conduct cannot by any possible means establish the first, for if a man says he loves God and hates his brother, he is a

liar. In this day we have got to put as much emphasis on one of these propositions as the other, and unfaithfulness to one weakens our support of the other. We can talk about the love of God with great ease, but it sometimes calls for heroism to practise love toward our brother. This practise has to be easy else all our talk of the divinity of Christ is only a dogma void of living faith. When love among us as believers in Jesus becomes so evident that it will be observable to all who know us, then we can talk with double force about the divinity of Christ and the love of God. The days that lie before us have to do with practical manifestations of love in the divided House of Christ and we are to find these expressions in the little things that go to make up Christian love as we find love in the little things in the households about us every day.

The necessity of this is evident because of the task before us. Christ has committed to us the greatest task of the ages. The winning of a world to Him lies in the hands of the Church. His commission is still as appealing as when He gave it to His disciples on the day of His ascension from the Mount of Olives. We are facing most complex conditions aside from the divisions of the Church. The world's interest in Christianity is not large. Vast multitudes among our English speaking people have either rejected it or are entirely indifferent to it; besides there are multitudes that have never heard of Jesus Christ at all. The missionary spirit is strong in some centers and great offerings of individuals and money are being made for the proclamation of the Gospel message, but these are small by the side of the time we have had in preparation for this century, as well as the great task that faces us.

Something more has got to be done. It must be done now. Japan, with her growing student body, China awakening from her long sleep, India with those fine elements of mysticism, have all a promise of growth to-

wards God, if a united Church can be the guide. But what hope have we when one religious body comes along with its message and another dissenting from it and a third dissenting from both, and so on, until Christianity appears as divisive and incompetent to many as the ethnic religions, which are all being rejected because of their lack of vital power? It is not that we must find some place of compromise to meet these issues, but we must find the truth. For some years the explorers have been going over the earth digging up tablets and bringing to light long buried facts regarding past history. Great sand drifts have covered cities, leaving not so much as a mark of the city above the surface, but the explorer has gone down and he has found the boundaries and foundations of these long buried cities. It must be so in our search for truth. Through the ages there have been accumulations. There must come the explorer for truth, casting away the rubbish as boldly as the explorer does in his search for an old tablet. The mind must be so educated that it shall be ready to receive the truth when unmistakable evidence has been presented. It is no little thing to be prepared to know, and the Church will never attain to her best and highest in service until she has prepared herself to know.

It is not in the spirit of iconoclasm that we are to tread our way back through the past. Many things that are being practised as well as believed have some relation to the truth, but the question that we must face is whether that relation is primary or secondary. Unity cannot come on secondary issues. It must be on the primary. Things that are left to research and prove to be secondary must take that place accordingly, letting the great things that have to do with Jesus Christ—His personality, His voice, His Spirit—be the chief things in finding fellowship at the feet of Him Whom we adore as Lord and Saviour.

A question has come to this office relative to the possi-

bility of reconciling the priesthood of the Church as interpreted by the Greek Church, the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican and Protestant Episcopal Church, basing this inquiry on the fact that the Greek Church does not recognize the Roman Catholic Church and that neither the Greek Church nor the Roman Catholic Church recognizes the orders of the Anglican or Protestant Episcopal Church, while the great Protestant household seeks to maintain the priesthood of all believers. It is a difficult problem, but it must be approached in the recognition that truth is not afraid of the light, neither is it embarrassed before severe tests. There are earnest minds in these various communions working heroically for some solution. Before very satisfactory advance can be made on the part of any of these Churches they have got to forget some history, or else be strong enough to rise above the ill feeling and prejudices of the past centuries. Some things have got to be done in the spirit of bigness, and sectarianism has got to be scourged out of the conference room. In this discussion of orders of the ministry the chief man to speak is Jesus Christ our Lord—not in the letter, but in the spirit that shall sweep in and sweep out until the validity of His claims shall hold priority over the validity of all orders and dogmas.

Another inquiry has come relative to adjusting the problem of Baptism, the Greek Church practising infant baptism by immersion and maintaining the immersion interpretation, while the Roman Catholic Church, acknowledging the Greek interpretation, practises sprinkling. The Anglican Church follows close after the Roman Catholic interpretation, while among the Protestants the majority hold to sprinkling or pouring and several of the large bodies, such as the Baptists and Disciples, hold to the immersion interpretation. This too is a difficult problem to meet. It is as old as the centuries and the theories of interpretation are deeply entrenched in the thought of the various communions ac-

cording to their practises. Whether this ordinance belongs in the realm of vital or formal Christianity is to be discussed with frankness and courtesy. Perhaps the majority of Christendom would put it on the side of vital Christianity. Others, especially in the Protestant household, would contend that it should be placed on the side of formal Christianity. To say the least, its place is unsettled, but there need be no fear in meeting the issue squarely, free from prejudice, and as open in the investigation as though it were a problem first mentioned to-day.

With it is associated the place of the Lord's Supper. The sacramentarian sees in it far more than those who observe it as a memorial. With the interpretation of the former has gone the deepening experiences of centuries, while in the observance of the latter has been the equally deepening experience of fellowship with the great heart of God. Both of these problems of the ordinances are not to be treated as of secondary importance. Whatever the future may decide it cannot be so treated now. There must be respect for people's convictions and experiences, but, as in the instance of the priesthood, we are to fall back to Him, Who was Himself baptized and commissioned His apostles to make disciples, baptizing others, and also Himself established the Supper, in the celebration of which millions have found satisfaction and peace. The solution of these problems must go back to the person and spirit of Jesus Christ. What did He do? What did He teach? What was His spirit? These questions cannot be answered offhand, but with the lamp of truth we must tread our way into the solution of these answers with the remembrance that both Christ and our brothers are accompanying us in our thoughts and our search for the way that leads to unity in the House of God.

The difficulty in many instances is that we are sitting in the dark and are ignorant of the thought and prac-

tises of the man next to us. We have taken his interpretations at second-hand. We have not known him as a brother, but instead we have known him as a Roman Catholic or a Greek Catholic or an Anglican or a Protestant. Is it not possible to know men as brothers who worship Christ with their hearts and fellowship in the task to find the way? It is hard to sink these barriers, but in the presence of Christ and the unfinished task before us these barriers must be sunk. The distinctive peculiarities are not the fundamentals of the religion of Christ. The fundamental life of these Churches is the presence of Jesus Christ from Whom has come their faith, piety and service.

A new experience must come to the human heart. A new senitiveness for the Christ must characterize us. A new inspiration for service must lead us into such sacrifice of self as will show without question our love for the Christ, Whose interests and plans are all beyond that of anything that we have thought or dreamed. The growth from what we are to what we must be furnishes prayerful observation. The power is here. It must be found just as electricity was found and harnessed. Only that power must use us in developing our growth into the unity of the Spirit, rather than to be used by us for the promulgation of our petty and divisive programmes.

STEPS TOWARDS REUNION

By a Sacerdotalist and Sacramentalist.

1. Coöperation between members and ministers of different religious bodies for purposes of *moral and social reform* involves no question of principle and is thoroughly desirable. But why limit such coöperation to representatives of Evangelical or Christian Churches? Why set up a barrier to the coöperation of Roman Catholics or Unitarians, of Jews or Agnostics? We want the help of all these in such matters. Some persons are kept back by a federation of "Churches," with which they are not prepared to associate themselves. Any line of inclusion means also a line of exclusion, and involves controversy on both sides. Should not these matters be cared for by *citizens as such,* inspired by whatever religious principles they profess, rather than by representatives of different religious bodies? We believe that the truer and fuller belief ought to give the greater inspiration, though in some cases it may lead to more balanced action.

2. Courtesy, consideration and fairness should always be shown in controversy, trying to see the matter from others' standpoint, and to view and represent their position in the best, not the worst, light; e. g., with Roman Catholics—the invocation of saints, transubstantiation, infallibility, or even indulgences; with Anglicans—their stiffness in adhering to the apostolic succession; with Protestants—their apparent laxity of belief and practise with reference to the sacraments, the ministry, and the great truths embodied in the creeds. No real advantage is gained by misrepresentation, whether intentional or unintentional; if a position is mistaken, its

reputation will be most effective when the position has first been clearly understood.

3. *Comity* should be shown (1) by not wantonly entering an occupied field, when there are many others needing care. Providing for our own scattered people must be recognized as a duty; but to organize a regular mission in a small place already well supplied, and where there is no seeking for our ministrations, is a different matter. (2) Comity should always be shown in upholding the discipline exercised by any religious body over its own members, and by not welcoming as a convert one who is under reasonable discipline in another body. Especially should this rule be observed with regard to regulations concerning marriage.

4. *Friendly intercourse* amongst members and ministers of different religious bodies should be encouraged, for the cultivation of neighborly relations, for the softening of controversial asperities, and the promotion of better mutual understanding of one another's position. *Conferences* for the discussion of topics in which all have an interest, whether scholarly or controversial, would be helpful.

5. The above is all distinct from *union services* or an undenominational platform, in which there is practically involved the recognition of ministerial equality (i. e., that all have an equally sufficient commission, whatever historical or utilitarian advantages some may possess which others have not), and of certain (or uncertain) residuum of essential Christian doctrine (for belief or practise), with the relegation of other doctrines or practises to a class of non-essential differences or preferences.

(a) If these points are not important, no religious body has the right to insist upon them for communion with itself; this is causing needless division, that is, schism.

(b) As a matter of fact all who adhere to catholic

tradition hold that the sacraments and the ministry (to mention only these two points) belong to the *integrity* of the Christian religion according to our Lord's design. If they are wrong, they must be won to the acknowledgment of their mistake; but they cannot be expected to act inconsistently with their principles. This is the fundamental difference between the proposed Conference on Questions of Faith and Order and schemes of federation. For instance, if confirmation is only an edifying ceremony for those who have been baptized in infancy, that they may themselves deliberately and openly make a profession of religion, of course none have a right to press this upon others who may achieve the same end in other ways. But if confirmation be a sacramental complement to baptism, of apostolic institution and catholic observance, we have no right to treat it as optional.

6. The preceding point will show that a consolidation or unification of Protestantism, however desirable in itself (unless it meant the reducing of all Protestant belief of the lowest common content), would be in no wise a reunion of Christendom, nor a step towards this; for it would set in greater antagonism to Protestants (or "non-sacerdotal" Christians) the Latin and the Eastern Communions, not to speak of losing the Anglican Church (whichever side it took) from its present mediating position as a link between Catholic and Protestant.

ARTHUR C. A. HALL.

HISTORIC EFFORTS IN BEHALF OF CONCILIATION AND PRESENT STATUS OF CHRISTIAN UNITY

By F. D. Kershner, LL.D.

I.

The subject assigned for this paper naturally and necessarily divides itself into two questions: First, an historical survey of the efforts toward Christian unity in the past; and, second, a statement of the status of Christian unity at the present time. In order to gain a proper understanding of these two questions, it is necessary to consider another which is preliminary to any logical discussion of the problems involved. This question is, what do we mean by the term, "Christian unity?" We shall accordingly proceed, first of all, to a definition of the subject which we are to study later in its historical implications, and with regard to the status in which we find it to-day.

II.

The Meaning of Christian Unity.

As Dr. Schaff has well expressed the situation "if by unity is meant agreement in all matters pertaining to religious authority and administration, then the Apostolic Church did not have it; if, however, by Church unity is meant devotion to Christ as the Son of God and the Redeemer of the world and a life conformed to His precepts and example, then the Apostolic Church had it." Unquestionably there were always differences of opinion between the early leaders of the Church. One needs only read the Epistle to the Galatians, for example, to

see that Peter and Paul themselves did not always agree upon various questions of Church polity and doctrine. The Council at Jerusalem held probably about 51 A.D., seems to have recognized a sort of parochial division of the world into two sections, Gentile and Judaic, and to have committed the gospel of uncircumcision to Paul and of the circumcision to Peter. This division, however, did not invalidate the common unity of the Church.

It is conceded by practically all Church historians of note that the early Church possessed no central ecclesiastical authority. The germs of the later despotic unity, it is true, are found rather early, perhaps the first occurring in the writings of Ignatius in the second century. And yet Ignatius does not recognize any supreme authority as vested in one ecclesiastical potentate. The episcopacy of which he speaks was quite evidently congregational, the presidency of one bishop in a congregation, just as Justin Martyr referred later to the chief officer of the Church as the "president of the congregation." It was left to Cyprian in 258 A.D., to give the episcopal theory its final form. According to him, the episcopate represents the succession of the apostles and to it are committed the deposit of faith as well as the office of teaching. His idea was expressed in the words, "*ecclesia est in episcopoi,*" "the Church is in the bishop," and hence the bishop is essential to the Church or negatively expressed—no bishop, no Church. Along with this idea of the episcopate as the centre of unity came the idea that there must be a formulated statement of Church doctrine as a condition of fellowship and communion. Hence arose the early creeds culminating in the Athanasian which went so far as to require the acceptance of its own highly theological dogmas as essential to salvation. Its concluding words are, "this is the catholic faith, which if a man believe not truly and firmly, he cannot be saved."

From the time of Leo I (450 A. D.) a third centre of Church unity was developed in the West. From his day on down to the present time the Roman pontiff has claimed to be the supreme ruler of the Church on earth, the successor of Peter and the Vicar of Christ. This view was re-affirmed with conclusive emphasis in the Vatican Council and was put forth by Leo XIII in an encyclical letter of June 29, 1896. These are the words of the letter:

"As He willed, His kingdom should be visible, Christ was obliged to designate a vicegerent on earth in the person of St. Peter. He also determined that the authority given Him for the salvation of mankind in perpetuity should be inherited by St. Peter's successors. The power of St. Peter is supreme and absolutely independent, so that, having no other power on earth as its superior, it embraces the whole Church and all things committed to the Church."

We see that we thus have three theories of Church unity. The first centres in Christ alone, the second in the bishop, and the third in the pope. These three theories are represented to-day by the positions of the Protestant advocates of unity proper, by the Anglican position and by the unchanging dogma of the Roman Catholic Communion.

We have not time in the limits imposed upon this paper to give in detail our reasons for refusing to accept the second or third of these positions. Doubtless no proof is required for those who will discuss the paper to show that the first only demands our consideration. We shall, therefore, pass over any references to the schism between the Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic Communion or any efforts to unite the Church upon the basis of an ecclesiastical hierarchy. Our concern will be solely with the attempts to secure unity upon the basis

of the first theory, that is, upon the lordship of Christ as independent of any other agency.

With this brief review and definition of the subject involved we are ready for our survey of the historical efforts toward Christian unity.

III.

The History of Christian Union.

When the Protestant Reformation began, there were those at the outset who recognized the dangers involved in schism, however necessary and unavoidable the schism might be. Zwingli and Melanchthon, among the Reformers, were especially anxious to avoid division and exerted their efforts to prevent it as far as possible. Luther, it must be confessed, had less of the irenic spirit and to his influence a good deal of the later extreme forms which denominationalism assumed in the Protestant ranks may be fairly charged. When Calvin, Melanchthon, Brenz and Bucer were willing to go into the historical conference called by Charles V, to attempt a reconciliation of all parties, Luther stood aloof. He said it would be a waste of time and money to discuss the situation. At Marburg in 1529, he refused to take Zwingli's hand and thus deepened the schism between the reforming parties. It was this intolerant attitude which made Erasmus, the most brilliant genius of the period of the Reformation, stand apart from Luther. Perhaps the first great advocate of reunion during this early period, however, was a man little known to-day but whose life deserves better acquaintance. We refer to George Cassander.

Cassander was born in 1513 only four years before Luther nailed his theses to the door of the Church in Wittenberg. He became a student in the University of Louvain, the institution which has become immortal through its tragic destruction in the Great War now rag-

ing in Europe. In 1544 he settled in Cologne where most of his life labor was accomplished. Here he wrote and taught down to the day of his death in February, 1566. Many of his books were placed upon the Roman Catholic Index and yet he appears to have been about equally unacceptable to the extreme Protestants of his age. Even to-day his ecclesiastical status appears undetermined. Modern encyclopedias written from the Roman Catholic viewpoint contend that although he could not have been a Protestant he was a very poor Roman Catholic, while the Protestant writers as a rule reject him. The fact is he belonged to the Erasmian school of thought but that he possessed a good deal more real religion and a good deal less scholastic temporizing than was characteristic of Erasmus himself.

Cassander held firmly to the idea that the ultimate source of all authority in religion is the Holy Scriptures. The Bible and the Bible alone was his test of all doctrine and authority. At the same time he was willing to go a long way in accepting non-essentials as regards forms and opinions, provided he could secure unity and peace. It is rather remarkable that he advocated what we now recognize as one of the very best methods of approaching the problem of unity, that is, by getting members of different Churches to unite in public worship and to practise, in this way, their points of agreement while forgetting, at least for the time being, their points of difference. He was especially opposed to partisan names, which he justly regarded as one of the chief causes of bad feeling and schism. His own words upon this question are worth recalling. "But above all," he says, "I hate those odious partisan names, derived from Tartarus, when one party calls the rest Papists, Anti-Christians, the ministers of Satan, the enemies of the doctrine of Christ; and the other side calls the first Heretics, Schismatics, Apostates, and enemies of the Church of Christ. Both

do nothing else than supply food and nourishment for the fatal schism and wretched dissolution of the Church."

George Cassander was ahead of his day. It is not certain that we have yet gotten up to his eminently sane and Christian point of view. Had his advice been followed the later terrible consequences of Christian dissension and disunity might well have been avoided. He is still a prophet without honor in the Church, but the time is sure to come when he will be recognized as one of the great thinkers and leaders of Christianity.

After Cassander, the man whose name stands out as the great apostle of unity during the Reformation period, was John Dury. Dr. Newman Smyth has lately written a monograph on the life of Dury which should be read by all who are interested in the historical side of the question of Christian unity. Dury's father was a Scottish minister who is said to have been an athlete as well as a preacher, a stalwart Presbyterian who once prayed the Lord either to convert or confound the Duke of Guise. His grandfather was a monk who had been suspected of heresy, and was once ordered to be shot—a fate which he escaped because some one else was shot in his place. Later he became a follower of Knox and a Presbyterian minister. Dury himself was ministering to a congregation of British merchants in Elbing, Prussia, a peculiar combination in the light of present day history, when he received the call to enter upon the great task of his life. Through a chance circumstance he was introduced to King Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, then the militant leader of Protestantism in Europe and one of the great historic figures of all time. The king himself appears to have suggested the idea of the reconciliation of the various Protestant parties and Dury entered whole-heartedly into the proposition. In his own words he says, "I came to this resolution (to secure Protestant reunion) that I made a vow of perseverance

in the worke, whether I received any reasonable furtherance of the worke or no, in respect that I conceived it to be a necessary duty, when the event did depend on God's special Providence." Dury stuck to his own vow throughout his life notwithstanding the constant and unvarying failure which attended his efforts. After gaining promise of support from the king of Sweden, he went to England to secure the aid of the English prelates. At first he was received with favor by Charles I, who was then king, and even by Archbishop Laud. They gave him a commission to go over into Germany to try to effect a reconciliation between the various parties in the Protestant world. To Germany, accordingly he went and held conference after conference with rulers, chancellors and divines throughout the continent. The narrative of his labors is found in a little book entitled, "A brief Relation of what John Dury hath prosecuted in the Worke of Ecclesiastical Pacification in Germany since the latter end of Julie 1631 till September 1633." At first he met with decided encouragement. Gustavus stood back of him and promoted his efforts and had it not been for the untimely death of the great Swedish monarch in the battle of Lutzen he might have succeeded. In order to further his work, about this time he took a remarkable step which may have its bearings upon the union problem to-day. Although he was a Presbyterian minister and held stoutly to the view that his ordination was valid, in 1634 he received additional ordination in the Cathedral of Exeter in order to the better understanding of his mission on the part of the Church of England. He took the view of John Humphreys, a Congregational minister in London in 1678, who did the same thing on the express understanding that he did not renounce his previous ordination, but accepted the new ordination as conferring additional jurisdiction, the one being as he expressed it, "*in foro Deii,*" "in the forum

of God," and the other being "*in foro ecclesiae Anglicanae,*" "in the forum of the Church of England."

Dury made two other visits to the continent and then came back to England. Charles the First had been overthrown and the Parliament ruled in his stead. Dury sat in the Westminster Assembly in 1645 and along with Richard Baxter used his influence toward securing a catholicity of sentiment toward all Protestants. Later Charles II, came to the throne and because of his association with Cromwell, Dury's efforts were negated. He died in 1680 at the age of 85. A few years before the end he wrote to the Princess of Cassel, "The principal fruit which I have received from all my toil is that from without I see the misery of the Christians, which is very much greater than that of the pagans and the other nations; I see the cause of that misery, I see the defeat of the remedy, and I see the cause of the defeat; I have no other reward than the testimony of my conscience." In a little more cheerful vein he added, "Although my earnest and constant solicitations have not been so effectual as I could wish, yet I must bless God that they have not been altogether without effect; for although there is not much appearing outwardly yet some grounds are laid which I am confident the gates of Hell shall not be able to shake."

Dury's confidence was not misplaced. After the lapse of centuries he is coming into his own. The method of conference which he employed with apparently such slight results is now being adopted by the Christian forces throughout the world. The platform adopted at the preliminary meeting of the World Conference on Faith and Order held in Garden City, Long Island, in January, 1916, is almost word for word a draft of Dury's language as contained in a volume entitled "A Way to Heal Our Present Distempers" and published early in the seventeenth century. Dr. Smyth, who was one of

the leaders in the World Conference, says himself that the similarity between Dury's proposals and the plan adopted at Garden City is so evident that "if the two were printed in parallel columns, the authors of the latter might be accused of unconscious plagiarism."

Dury was just two hundred and sixty-nine years ahead of his times. Nearly everything he advocated and even his very identical language is now being appropriated by the leaders of thought in the Christian world. Like Cassander he was a prophet unrecognized in his own day but now rapidly coming into his rightful heritage.

We have not space to devote to a study of the other apostles of unity during the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. We can scarcely indeed list their names. There was George Calixtus, who tried to find a basis for union in the Apostles Creed; Hugo Grotius, the founder of international law, who was interested in securing peace among the Churches as much as he was in securing peace between the nations; Leibnitz, the philosopher who tried to unite the Lutheran and Reformed Communions in Germany; Dupin, the Roman Catholic, who exerted his efforts to bring together Protestants, Catholics and the Greek Churches and got censured by Pope Clement XI; Richard Baxter, who said, "If all Christians were reduced to a holy concord, it would do more to win the heathen world than all other means can do without it;" Stillingfleet, Bishop of Worcester, who tried to unite the Episcopalians and Presbyterians; John Owen who said, "Wherever there is a man or a body of men, who are united to Him (Jesus Christ) by a living faith and are keeping His commandments, he or they are in communion with the Church of God;" Meldinius, who coined the maxim, "In essentials, unity; in non-essentials, liberty; in all things, charity;" Chillingworth, who, dying in prison, said: "the Bible and the

Bible only is the religion of Protestantism," and "require of Christians only to believe in Christ and to call no man master but Him only," and above all, Johannes Coccejus, professor in the University of Leyden, who has been styled the father of modern exegesis and from whom Alexander Campbell borrowed the outline for his famous "Sermon on the Law."

All these men were forerunners of the dawn. The nineteenth century opened with schism at its height, it closed with the whole world's striving toward unity. Only the briefest analysis of the development of this new era is permissible in the pages which follow.

Four great factors entered into the progress of Christian unity in the nineteenth century. First, the rise of the sentiment in favor of foreign missions; second, the tendency toward interdenominational activities; third, the adoption of the method of council instead of antagonism by the Churches, and fourth, the direct propaganda for union on the apostolic basis usually known as the Restoration movement or the "Current Reformation." We shall merely sketch the lines of activity of these four influences.

The foreign mission movement which practically began with the opening of the century has tended toward union in three ways: First, it laid emphasis in the home Churches on the great evangelistic essentials of Christianity and thus caused men to think less of non-essentials, while it led them, at the same time, to realize that the success of the missionary enterprise is dependent, as Christ Himself made it in the intercessory prayer, upon the union of His followers; Second, it forced the missionaries of rival Communions together on the foreign field and showed them the folloy of disunion in the face of the baffling problems of heathenism; and, Third, the reflex influence of the union sentiment generated abroad has reacted with tremendous weight at home. To expand

and interpret these influences would require a volume in itself; here we can do no more than chronicle the facts.

The rise of interdenominational activities has been one of the striking phenomena of the century. So numerous have been these activities that we can do little more than mention their names. The various Bible societies, which were strictly interdenominational from the first, were among the earliest examples. Then came the Y. M. and Y. W. C. A. and in 1846 the Evangelical Alliance. The meeting of the latter in 1873 in New York City was one of the outstanding items in the religious history of the century. The organization of the Evangelical Alliance was followed and accompanied by similar alliances among denominational groups. Notable illustrations were the Lambeth Conference of Episcopal Churches in 1867, the Alliance of Reformed Churches, sometimes called the Pan-Presbyterian Alliance in 1876, the Ecumenical Conference of Methodists in 1881, the International Council of the Congregational Churches in 1891, and the Baptist World Conference in 1905. Perhaps with these, we should group the Edinburgh World Missionary Conference of 1910. Some of the fruits of these conferences may be found in the actual combination of certain of the constituents of these groups; as, for example, the union of the Old and New School branches of the Presbyterian Churches in America in 1870, the Union of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., with the Cumberland Presbyterians in 1905, the amalgamation of the various Presbyterian and Methodist groups in Canada and the probability of still more comprehensive union in that country, the union of the Free and United Scotch Presbyterian Churches in 1901, and the apparently approaching union of the Methodist forces in the United States. In Germany the Lutheran and Reformed elements of the Evangelical Church have united and in

England the National Council of the Evangelical Free Churches was formed in 1898.

The organization of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor was in many respects one of the outstanding movements toward unity of the century. It is to be regretted that reactionary denominational influences have tended to divide the Endeavor forces and yet the movement itself has been of tremendous value in fostering the sentiment of unity.

The culmination of the interdenominational activities of the period is found in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, which had its origin in the New York meeting of 1905. The Federal Council has been of great value in promoting the feeling of unity and is destined to prove of greater value in the years to come.

We can not do more than name a few of the other cooperative Christian influences, such as the Laymen's Missionary Movement, the Men and Religion Forward Movement, the Home and Foreign Missions Council, and the union evangelistic efforts which are now so common throughout the land. The Churches are learning to work together and in doing so are inevitably coming closer together in fact.

Along with the federation, in various forms of religious activity, of the Churches has come the adoption of the method of council and conference advocated by John Dury. The Protestant Episcopal Church, which has more or less held aloof from the other efforts toward unity, has especially emphasized this method. In 1886 the Chicago meeting of the bishops of the Episcopal Church put forth a declaration of unity which was crystallized in the so-called Lambeth Quadrilateral of 1888. The planks in this "quadrilateral" were the following: The Holy Scriptures as the all sufficient rule of faith and practise, the Apostles and Nicene creeds as a sufficient

formulation of doctrine; the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper as the irreducible norm of ordinance, and the Historic Episcopate as the method of Church polity. In 1910, the House of Bishops meeting in Cincinnati took steps toward calling a World Conference on Faith and Order, the preliminary meeting of which was held in Garden City, New York, in 1916. Simultaneous with the movement toward a world conference, the Council of Congregational Churches in 1910 took action in favor of conference with other Churches upon the question of unity, and the Presbyterians and Disciples of Christ took similar action the same year. Numerous conferences have resulted since this time and unquestionably much has been done in the way of securing a better understanding between Christians of all types of religious conviction.

It is scarcely necessary to recapitulate the history of the fourth great movement toward Christian unity of the last century, inasmuch as this history must be a commonplace to all who will hear this paper. We need only call attention to the fact that the value of the contribution made by the Campbells and their followers toward the cause of unity can not be adequately measured by the external success, great as it has been, of the movement. The currents set in motion by the Restoration fathers have powerfully affected their religious neighbors, whether the latter are conscious of the fact or not. The one feature in which the Campbells and Stone made a distinct contribution different from all others is in the fact that they presented and still present a definite, concrete, and workable plan for unity. The other forces, with the exception of the Lambeth proposals, have simply tended toward unity without attempting to furnish a definite basis for its accomplishments.

IV.

The Present Status.

There remains but brief space for the discussion of the present status of the Christian unity problem. Much indeed of what might be written upon the subject has been already covered in the historical review.

The first thing which claims our attention in connection with the present status of Christian unity is that the twentieth century is inevitably the heir of the nineteenth. Moreover the tendency of the union movement is to gather inertia as it goes forward. More progress was made in the first decade of the present century than in the first five decades of the nineteenth or in the four centuries which preceded the nineteenth put together. The union sentiment is still a good deal muddled and by no means clear cut in the minds of the majority of Protestants, but it exists very definitely and positively none the less. It is destined to bear fruitage, although just what shape the ultimate outcome will take it is perhaps impossible to say. In the stress of the present world convulsion anything which looks like peace or unity is not claiming the immediate attention of most people. When the storm is over, however, the reaction will come and then the movement toward unity will be stronger than ever. Just as the revulsion against the awful waste and foolishness of this war is likely to lead all peoples to make war impossible when they come to their senses, so the folly and sin of Church disunion will make them put an end to it when the period of calm reflection arrives.

There are three considerations connected with the present world situation which are destined to exert very considerable influence upon the future of Christian unity. The first is the fact that Church disunion and religious separation helped to bring on, or at least made it impossible to prevent, the struggle. When the day of sober

reflection comes to the war-torn and orphaned millions of the world, they are going to look with peculiar aversion upon every cause which helped to contribute to their misery. The Church will not escape their criticism, and wherein it has fallen short, their condemnation. The masses of French, English, German and Russian Protestants, Catholics and Greek Orthodox communicants are going to ask why the great brotherhood of the Church should not serve its prime purpose of uniting men in love and helpfulness instead of impotently abetting their dissensions and quarrels. The old formal orthodoxy of the rival ecclesiasticisms of the past is doomed to a heavy reckoning. When men secure peace in the political realm they are going to demand peace in the religious, recognizing the fact that if they had possessed the latter, they would never have had to pay for the former with their blood.

This leads us to the further consideration that the coming dawn of internationalism, which is inevitably foreshadowed by the entrance of the whole world into war, is destined to mean internationalism in religion as well as in the sphere of statesmanship. The period of isolation and aloofness in religion is over, just as the same period is over in politics. Nations can no longer shut themselves up, build a Chinese wall around their borders, and say, "We will have nothing to do with our neighbors." In the same way, the Churches will have to realize that they can not stand aloof from each other and live. Narrow sectarianism is destined to speedy extinction after the guns of the Great War have been silenced.

A third implication of the present world situation is that the days of religious autocracy and despotism are numbered, along with days of monarchial tyranny in politics. The big political despotisms have been the strongholds of the big religious despotisms and when the

one type goes the other type will go with it. The era of democracy in world politics will mean increasingly the era of democracy in world religion, and the democracy will tend more and more in both cases toward the coöperation of a common unity. The Reformation had to break down the barriers of religious despotism before the unity of democracy, which is the only real Christian unity, became possible. The unity of absolutism which prevailed in the Middle Ages has passed never to return. The disunity fostered by state religions which grew up after the Reformation is likewise destined to pass forever. We are now on the threshold of a new world era of democracy which will mean the free unity of a common brotherhood, both politically and religiously. And this unity will mean the ushering in of the real Kingdom which Jesus came to establish, the long sought and but slowly realized Kingdom of God on earth.

Perhaps these conclusions may seem over optimistic in an analysis of the present status of Christian unity, but the writer believes that they are directly involved in the changes which are now going on in world affairs. It is not to be presumed that they will all appear immediately but we believe they are inevitably and rapidly in process of realization. No man can read the signs of the times without seeing that the world is headed in this direction. Even the most extreme denominationalists of the present day are recognizing the general trend. In an editorial which appeared recently in one of the most strait-laced publications of the Southern Baptist Church, perhaps the most denominational of all present day communions, the prediction is made that in a short time there will be only three Churches in the United States, the Roman Catholic, the Federal, and the Baptist. The editor thinks it is just possible that two others may be added, what he styles the Liberal Church to be made up of Unitarians, Monists, Agnostics and others who can not

get in the Federal Communion, and a new combination of the strictly orthodox in all the others on the basis of Herbert Booth's "Christian Confederacy." In any event he feels sure that the days of ultra-denominationalism are over. This confession from one of the extreme advocates of the separatist idea shows clearly the trend of the times. It is a great concession from such an angle to grant the speedy appearance of only three or five separate Churches. The fact that this concession is made shows how inevitable is the movement toward unity.

It would be interesting to pursue the question as to what the present day implications hold with reference to the basis of the coming unity. This, however, is outside of our province. One thing only may be indicated and that is that the old ecclesiastical and dogmatic shells which humanity has outgrown will disappear. With their disappearance will come the birth of a new creation, the beautiful and resplendent bride of the King, the Holy City, the New Jerusalem on earth which the seer of Patmos saw in his vision and which the future holds for the purified and Christianized sons of men.

F. D. Kershner.

TRUTH, FREEDOM, PROGRESS, UNITY—THE IDEALS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION*

By C. Moxon, M.A., Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union, Richmond, Yorkshire, England.

What is going to be the effect of the war upon the Church is the question on the lips of many Christians to-day. Two effects are already unmistakeable. First, a preoccupation with the deep and simple truths of the Gospel and a tendency to lower the denominational barriers that seem so high and insurmountable in times of peace at home. And, secondly, a refusal to overemphasize the points of ritual, organization and speculation that consume so much time and energy at home. We are all familiar with the many stories of Christian friendliness and fellowship displayed by the various sects of Christendom behind the firing lines. It is impossible to imagine that the men who return at the peace will wish to take part in squabbles about the details of ritual and ministry as if they were the very pillars of the faith itself. These soldiers who know what life and death mean will never again feel at home in Churches which show more anxiety about vestments, apostolic succession or ancient formulæ than about spreading goodness and the principles of Christ in the hearts of men and in the laws of society. The men who have seen the imperative need of unity and coöperation of the Allies for victory in battle will never respect the Churches which ought to fight the battles of Christ as allies and yet hold aloof from one another because they do not all possess a uniform creed or ritual. These men will see that it is a fatal policy to refuse to

*The author alone is responsible for the interpretation here given to the ideals of the Churchmen's Union.

ally ourselves with other Protestant Churches in the battles for truth and righteousness in order that some day we may possibly seem acceptable allies in the sight of the Churches of Greece or of Rome.

We believe then that after the war there will be large spiritual forces refusing to tolerate the old cramping, convential barriers and yet recognizing the call of Christ in their life.

If these men and thousands like them at home are to be made members of Churches they must hear the invitation from some within who are working actively on the same lines.

It is certain that the greater freedom, unity, love of truth and courage to discard error which we desire for our Church can never come automatically. No doubt truth will prevail in the end, but that is not the question for us. The question is shall we make our ideals prevail IN OUR CHURCH before it is too late and the Spirit of Truth has found other more living organs for His activity.

Now here lies a challenge to the Church and in particular here is the call to the Churchmen's Union which exists to promote the ideals of truth, freedom, progress, and unity in the Church of Christ.

Our opponents try to picture us as a merely intellectual school of thought with little interest in religious life and no fruitful activity. But that is a caricature of the true modernist, who never pulls down for the joy of it but always destroys and criticizes in order that the simple minded and the sincere may the more easily see the way of life and walk in it without the stumbling-blocks of error in their path.

Our Union might be called a society for the propagation of faith in the living God who is ever revealing Himself to mankind. It is especially a fellowship or con-

fraternity of the Holy Spirit. For we believe in the essentially catholic idea of growth and development and we believe it our duty to hear what new truth and duty the Spirit is giving to the Churches in our day.

Now if we believe that God has new tasks and new truths for our days we cannot without falling into the most serious error suppose that the orthodoxy of the past is final and perfect. To us it seems that to bind all the Churches forever to the formulæ of the Hebrew, Greek or Roman periods, is to attempt to bind the Word or Spirit of God and to shut our ears to His present activity. Therefore we seek God's revelation not only in the past but also in the present. Therefore we distinguish our imperfect creeds and ideals from the perfect Kingdom of Heaven for which it is our task to live and work.

If at times we seem to spend much time on details, such as the apostolic succession or the exact manner of Christ's resurrection, it is because we see the backward looking Christians making these uncertain and unessential matters into tests for clergy or conditions of membership in the Catholic Church. We indeed believe that God means that we should look back, to Jesus, to the creeds and rules of the past, but only that we may be guided to look with clearer sight towards the future and so perform the tasks that God has laid upon us in the present. We believe that religion is essentially a life which is a loyalty to the Highest. We therefore welcome the prophets and the pathfinders and we are determined to raise our voices and to make it impossible to silence and persecute these truthseekers in our Church or to drive or keep them out of it.

The Churchmen's Union stands for belief in progressive revelation, and in the freedom of research and utterance necessary to the increasing vision of truth. Hence

we reject absolutely as a false ideal the attempt to gain unity by way of uniformity. We rejoice in differences of belief, worship and organization as signs of life. But our aim is to encourage friendly relations between all Christian bodies and to regard them as living branches of the Catholic Church. We desire not so much corporate reunion with other Churches (personally I am against the attempt to minimize or abolish these healthy divisions) but rather we want close coöperation, full recognition and unrestricted intercommunion. A determined attempt is going to be made by our backward looking Catholics to procure not only the condemnation of the Holy Communion at Kikuyu, but also of all proposals for coöperation with non-Episcopalians on the basis of full fellowship as between the members of the one Body of Christ. The problems, both social, political and international, which face us are so immense that they urgently call us to unite with all men of good will in order to promote better social and international relations. The ideals of peace, of economic and social justice and well being which we share with other Churches are infinitely more important than our differences, which need be no bar at all to a closer alliance in the war against evil for the Kingdom of God. Now these aims and ideals of ours can never be realized unless a body of persons are so fired by them that they will gain the power that comes of fellowship and united action. And that is the justification for the Churchmen's Union, and that is also, I venture to think, a call to all Christians who share our ideals to promote unity, not on the basis of a common creed but in loyalty to a single ideal—the realization of truth, freedom and progress in all the relations of life.

C. Moxon.

THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT

By JULIUS H. HORSTMANN, Editor of The Evangelical Herald,
St. Louis, Mo.

PERHAPS the most striking fact about the universe, aside from its vastness, is the unity that prevails throughout its boundless expanse in spite of the infinite variety of detail manifest in every one of its spheres. If the oneness of God was the unique and special message of the Old Testament, a message which the New Testament fully confirms and establishes, this unity is naturally and wonderfully reflected in the work of creation and the government of the world. The successive steps of the creation could not have been better adapted to their final end, the glory of God and the welfare and happiness of His creatures. And throughout the manifold diversity of the works of God in the heavens and upon the earth there is plainly evident to all who have eyes to see a perfect harmony of action and a marvelous unity of plan and providence.

The manner in which God revealed Himself to man shows the same beautiful unity of design and detail. The Word of God, though given to mankind through an infinite variety of mind and method, in widely divers times and under greatly differing conditions, is nevertheless remarkable for its singleness of aim and unity of plan. And the human race itself, though it includes the greatest differences and contrasts of color, features, language, temperament and mental capacity, to say nothing of the great variety of ways of living, manner of working, also shows the same fundamental physical, mental and moral characteristics, so that really no other explanation is thinkable than the one given by Paul in Acts 17:26. And finally the one great need of mankind, salvation from sin

and a new spiritual life, makes necessary for all the world the one way of salvation (Acts 4:12).

With such a mass of testimony toward a wonderful unity of design and execution everywhere in the universe, it would be strange indeed if those who are to enjoy the richest blessings of God, the climax toward which all this preparatory work has been directed, should form an exception to the general law. The more one realizes that there is one God, one creation, one revelation, one race of men and one way of salvation, the more inevitable becomes the conclusion that the believers in Christ Jesus must constitute *one body,* a multitude of members and organs which, while differing greatly in form and function, are nevertheless essentially one organism and are directed and maintained by a supreme unity of mind, heart and will. It is this unity among His believers for which Jesus prayed so fervently during the last hours of His earthly life, and which He makes the primary condition of the fulfilment of His great world-task. And it is this same unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace for which Paul contends so eloquently. This unity of the Spirit was so important to Jesus and to Paul because they understood and foresaw, as none of those about them could, the manner in which the divisions and dissensions of believers would hinder and weaken the accomplishment of the great world-task to which their lives were devoted.

There is no need of pointing out to the readers of this magazine the evils which have come about through the deplorable dissensions of the followers of Jesus Christ. None are more familiar than they with the trail of strife and misery and bloodshed which these dissensions have left behind them in the history of the Church, and none can desire more earnestly than they a permanent relief from the waste and inefficiency and narrowness which characterizes the work of the Church to-day. There is

no reason, no need, not even an excuse, for the well-nigh endless divisions and subdivisions of Protestantism. They have come about because Christian people have been cocksure about things which the Bible, the sole and infallible rule of faith and conduct, was content to leave open, or because they insisted upon things which it does not think important enough to deserve a definite statement. Protestants have always been in practical agreement upon the fundamentals, but they have divided on the things concerning which full and definite information was denied us, or concerning that which was unessential and unimportant. If it had made any difference to Jesus whether or not baptism was by sprinkling or immersion, or what believers thought about the manner in which they received His body and His blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we may be very sure that He would have definitely indicated the proper method and the right idea. On the other hand, to think that it could make any difference to Him whether His followers wear buttons, single or double, or use hooks and eyes; or whether they sing psalms or hymns, or psalms *and* hymns; or whether they believe in the Historic Episcopate or in the congregational or presbyterial system as a form of organization, is irreverence for and profanation of the sublime and eternal truth He teaches.

It is no wonder that many of the noblest men and women that ever lived have turned away in disgust from such a state of affairs, and that many other brave and earnest persons have lost faith in the Church of Christ and what it stands for. It is no wonder that in view of such conditions it has taken nearly two thousand years to preach the Gospel to one-third of the human race, and that we have prayed almost in vain, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." It was expecting altogether too much of the world that it should be willing to believe that the Father had sent Jesus Christ

and commanded His disciples to preach His Gospel to all the nations, when the whole attitude and most of the actions of the disciples themselves tended to disprove their claims.

What is the remedy? It has long been recognized that Christians, and especially Protestants, had many beliefs in common and many common tasks which should really permit of a large measure of coöperation. From the foreign mission field, where the Church found itself face to face with the very hosts of Satan undisguised, and where it could least of all afford to show a divided front, we have learned the advantages of federation. In our own country, where the evils of Protestant division are most manifest, the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ is teaching the leaders in the Churches, laymen as well as pastors, to overlook their denominational divisions and dissensions and to work together in the service of the common Lord for the common good. The federation idea, and the organization of the Federal Council, has grown out of the demand for economy of effort and efficiency of administration, and the progress it has brought into American Church life and work cannot easily be exaggerated.

But not even the most ardent advocates of federation will claim that this was all Jesus had in mind when He prayed "that they may all be one." The unity among His disciples and all those who would come to believe in Him through their word was much richer, deeper and larger than was implied in working together in a common cause for the sake of expediency or efficiency. And when Paul speaks of the believers in Christ as members of one body he too has something far higher and greater in mind than a mere aggregation of similar organizations. Federation is only the first step toward the higher and better attitude and condition which the Master saw as the ideal; it is a matter of policy rather than of convic-

tion; a means, not an end; not a goal but only a step toward it. The very terms of the constitution under which the Federal Council was organized prevent it from limiting in any way the full autonomy of any of the Christian bodies adhering to it; that is, it has no power to do away with any of the existing divisions among its members.

We do not think it desirable that any organization should have such power, because true unity of the Spirit is not brought about by drawing up a common creed or form of worship or government. Unity of the Spirit is a matter of the spirit and not of the letter; a problem of life rather than a matter of belief; a state of mind rather than an intellectual conception. Christian unity is far higher than uniformity as to creed, government or worship. God did not want all men to think alike and act alike, or He would have fashioned them so that they could do it without stunting themselves or stultifying Him. Diversity is a divine decree and is an essential expression of life. All the beauty, richness and value of life depend upon it. And God has given to each human being his own mind and point of view and no one has any right to attempt to force a change. The unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace requires the recognition of each man's right to his own judgment, subject only to personal loyalty to Christ. And the greater the loyalty toward Christ the greater the tolerance toward the opinions and beliefs of others who are also sincerely loyal toward Him.

The Evangelical idea. For the sake of brevity we have called this spirit of loyalty toward Christ and liberty toward all believers the "Evangelical idea," not because the Evangelical Church assumes any rights of discovery or asserts any proprietary privileges, but because it is the true Gospel idea and the great Gospel ideal. The Evangelical idea is as old as Christianity. It was born in the heart of its Founder and found beautiful expression in the Apostolic Church, and the Evangelical Church

has merely chosen this particular expression of Christian life as her special task and seeks to bear witness in its behalf and in behalf of everything that may help to enforce it. The Evangelical idea is higher than federation, deeper than coöperation, richer than organic union. It involves no confession save that of Christ, no sacrifice except that of the self-conceit which claims superior knowledge or authority. It puts Christ above His interpreters, Christian living above Christian dogma, and truth above mere opinions. Those whom the Son has made free are free indeed, and neither council, church nor creed may impose any yoke of bondage upon them.

That such loyalty and liberty is not only thinkable but also practicable, is shown conclusively in the Apostolic Church. Jesus Christ did not become the Founder of His Church by laying down a complete and inviolable set of laws for His followers, but by obtaining an eternal redemption and giving the Holy Spirit to His disciples. Neither did the apostles establish any absolute form for the order of worship, or the organization of congregations, and many divers usages prevailed among Jewish and Gentile Christians. The apostles merely laid down certain principles that were to govern the adjustment of too marked differences (Acts 15; 1 Cor. 11).

There was a great difference of opinion, for instance, as to the partaking of meat that had been offered to idols (Rom. 14:1, 2, 14-21 and 1 Cor. 8:4-7) and as to the observance of certain days (Rom. 14:6) yet there is no record of even the desire to excommunicate any one on that account. In the face of these differences Paul only seeks to strengthen the consciousness of their unity in Christ and deprecates the self-conceit which would condemn others (1 Cor. 12). Even where the Jewish brethren in Rome preached Christ not sincerely, but thinking to raise up affliction for him in his bonds (Phil. 1:15-18) he did not desire to excommunicate. *That only Christ is*

proclaimed is his great concern, and he willingly recognizes what he has in common with these teachers, though it is a very small basis.

Greater even than these differences are those in the teachings of the apostles themselves. The writer of Hebrews, for instance, regards the atonement through Christ from the Old Testament point of view in the light of a priestly function; in Romans it is portrayed as a deeply personal experience. According to Hebrews, eleventh chapter, faith has the more general character of confidence and trust, rather than the justifying character which it has for Paul. The difference between Paul's and James' idea of faith is even more marked, and the two views can be reconciled only by reducing them to the common denominator of loyalty to Christ and consecrated individual experience. Then there is the difference between Paul and Peter alluded to in Gal. 2:11, and the deep-seated differences between Jewish and Gentile Christians on many important matters. These differences were not regarded as fundamental, but rather as necessary accompaniments of the development of Christian experience and teaching among peoples of differing temperament. No one was required or even expected to abandon or modify any views he might hold on any subject, nor was any one persecuted, condemned or ridiculed for believing as he did; neither is there any interruption of Christian fellowship or communion, as Gal. 2:9 shows. See also Acts 15:7; 8:14, 23, 25, where there is not only mutual recognition, but every indication of intimate fellowship between the persons and parties holding different views.

Nor did all this freedom of thought and action in any way hinder the development of the Church. But in spite of it—*or was it because of it?*—the Word of God grew and multiplied, and the number of disciples multiplied exceedingly wherever Christ was proclaimed. Never

again has the Gospel spread with such power and rapidity, though it never afterward encountered the fierce and tremendous opposition which sought to destroy it during the first three centuries. What made the early Church so powerful was the fact that it put loyalty to Christ absolutely above every other consideration. The Church of to-day will not regain that power until she restores that condition.

What can be done about it? The Evangelical idea involves no scheme or platform for Christian unity, nor does it imply the winning of any one to anything, except to the confession of Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Saviour of men. It involves no sacrifice of cherished opinions or silence as to conscientious convictions. It merely emphasizes loyalty to Jesus Christ as the one essential of Christian discipleship, and the fundamental principle of Christian liberty, that all whose supreme desire is to serve Jesus Christ loyally can be fully trusted to have their own ideas about what to believe or what to do, and stand or fall to their own Lord alone. No one, no matter what achievements or experience he may have to his credit, has any right to dictate the form which an expression of loyalty to Jesus Christ shall assume, or to judge whether that loyalty exists. Loyal disciples of Christ may make mistakes or go astray, but they will not remain in error or astray as long as they remain loyal to their Lord and Leader. And when they cease to be loyal they lose their discipleship, as Judas did, without being deprived of it.

The Evangelical idea neither demands nor discourages organic union of Christians. If organic union is ever realized it can only come about as the result of the working of the spirit of loyalty and liberty for which the Evangelical idea stands. Let us seek to get away from the spirit of combat and controversy in our denominational attitude and intercourse. Let us try to be abso-

lutely fair to every one who professes to be loyal to Jesus Christ. Let us not be afraid to tell our people what other denominations have and are and what they are doing, even if their creeds or their organizations do not tally with our own. Let us not seek to glorify Calvin or Luther, or any other human being or institution, but Jesus Christ alone. Those who are Christ's own cannot condemn or ridicule or even smile at what others who are also Christ's own think or do. Their opinions and convictions are just as sacred in the eyes of Christ as our own—and they may be much more valuable. Sincere devotion to Jesus Christ can safely be trusted with any theory as to the method or meaning of baptism or the Lord's Supper, and with any form of organization. Nor is it of any great consequence whether or not or in how far they agree as to the merits of emotional or educational evangelism or as to the value and righteousness of prohibition. Only as Christians learn to respect each other's feelings and opinions can they really serve their common Saviour and complete their common task in the unity of the Spirit and the bond of peace.

JULIUS H. HORSTMANN.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PULPIT

MARTIN LUTHER AND THE REFORMATION*

By George William Douglas, D.D., S.T.D.

By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, obeyed; and he went out, not knowing whither he went.—Hebrews 11:8.

While one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of Apollos; are ye not carnal? Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man? . . . And every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour. For we are labourers together with God. . . . Whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed.—1 Cor. 3:4, 5, 8, 9; 15:11.

Some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will. . . . What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice. . . . For to me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.—Philippians 1:15, 18, 21.

Thou fool . . . . that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain. . . . But God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed His own body.— 1 Cor. 15:36, 37, 38.

In view of the Quadricentenary of the Reformation which is now being widely celebrated, our rector has specially requested me to address you on Martin Luther and the Reformation. It is a stirring theme: as large as life, as mysterious, as difficult to grasp, or to present at all in a single sermon. Luther was one of the world's greatest personalities. He bulks large in human history, in the history of the Church, and in our personal experience as individual Christians. To place him or explain him adequately is beyond our power, for he was an instrument of God Most High. Yet any of us Christian folk assembled here, if our religious experience is at all mature and intelligent, must have something to say about him, for we have duplicated in a small way what Luther went through in a large way. By our personal experi-

*Sermon preached by George William Douglas, D.D., S.T.D., in the Church of The Beloved Disciples, New York, on the 21st Sunday after Trinity, October 28th, 1917; and in St. Mary's Church, Tuxedo Park, N. Y., on the 22nd Sunday after Trinity, November 4th, 1917. Published by request.

ence we can take tally of Luther's, and form an estimate which will be near the truth that Luther still stands for in the wide, wide world. And one of the marvels of the New Testament is that, fourteen centuries before Luther, the Apostle Paul, out of his own experience in the Primitive Church, was able to lay his finger on the same main points that Luther illustrated for our help and admonition. Paul did so in several such poignant passages as the four which I have assembled for my text to-day.

There is no time for me to touch the darker, more dubious and painful aspects of the great Reformer's career and influence, and their parallels to your life and mine in our distracted times. I shall simply seize two of the evidently encouraging aspects of Luther's life, together with another, central to Christianity, where, looking backward, Luther's experience duplicated St. Paul's; and where, looking forward, it anticipated ours, and confirmed the substance of our faith, our hope, our charity. Nor would I, in all this, have you think of ourselves as far removed from the Primitive Christian era. In the twenty-five thousand years, or more, which modern science has revealed as the actual span of man's evolution on this planet as a self-conscious and religious personality, the difference of time and of relative attainment between Paul and Luther and ourselves is less considerable than we often think it. In a just comparison of times and seasons such as the Word of God prompts us to make, we may well regard ourselves as members of the still Primitive Church, so vast are the prospects of further development for the Church of the Living God, where

> "behind the great unknown
> Standeth God within the shadow,
> Keeping watch above His own."

First of all, then, Luther stands for the inalienable right and duty of the individual Christian to exercise his

private judgment in religion. Already the twelve Apostles had stood for that to the point of martyrdom, against Jew and Gentile. In Paul's own words, they "exercised their conscience toward God and toward men." But as with pagan religions, so with the Christian, in the centuries between Paul and Luther there had been a revival of the inveterate tendency of ecclesiasticism and clericalism to render private judgment inoperative. So, under the frown of the Middle Ages, at the Diet of Worms in 1521 Martin Luther uttered the words that rang out over Europe as the motto of the Reformation: "My conscience is held by the Word of God. To act against conscience is unsafe and unholy. I can do nought else. Here stand I. So help me God. Amen."

Thereafter, however, the Papacy for four centuries continued to employ from the Vatican the machinery of Romanism to revive and reassert the primacy of an infallible Pope over and above the primacy of the individual conscience; and all the old arguments, pro and con, have been banded about. In England two of the cleverest and best educated of modern men, Mr. Gladstone and Cardinal Newman, entered into the discussion, and published pamphlets when my ministry was just beginning. Step by step, like an indomitable swordsman, but with the spirit of a Luther, Gladstone pushed Newman to the wall, and wrung from him this admission: "If I were called on at a banquet to drink the health of the Pope and of private judgment, I should drink to private judgment first, and to the Pope afterwards."

Thus Luther's great contention still stands. And this doubtless was intended by the recent remark of an eloquent man, that what is wanted to cure the mistakes of Protestantism is *more Protestantism,*—a more valiant and persevering judgment of the ever new truth and experience that God vouchsafes to men. But let none of us forget the heart-searching implications of it. Broth-

ers, in substance and effect, if you assert sincerely your right and duty of private judgment in the religion of Jesus Christ, it carries you back to the Passion and Crucifixion, when our Lord hung on the Cross between two thieves; and those two each exercised their judgment on Him; and the penitent, after confessing his faith in Jesus, added, "Lord, remember me." When you assert your private judgment in favor of our Lord, that means you are sure that He will remember you; and that you stand before Him expectant that He will recognize you as you are—as He, to Whom no secrets are hid, knows you to be. God made you in His own image, so that even before Him something in you asserts your self-hood. The I am that I am in you asserts itself to the great I AM, in Whom you have your being; but that self-assertion carries with it the profoundest self-abasement and cry for pardon.

"Just as I am, without one plea,
But that Thy blood was shed for me,
And that Thou bidd'st me come to Thee,
O Lamb of God, I come."

Secondly. In his later years Luther in his *Table-talk* admitted that he had not foreseen the outcome of his action: that, like Abraham of old, he went out not knowing whither he went. After the lapse of four hundred years, we can better estimate the consequences of Luther's move for the Reformation. To the rigid ecclesiastics of his day the bold Reformer appeared to be disrupting the Church, letting in nothing but the vagaries of the Antinomian radicals, and the "Robbing Rats of the Peasant War" and the utter skeptics that followed in their tracks. But with the progress of the years, we, in a juster prospective, can see that what Luther really stood for in the Church was what the Allies in this present world-war are standing for both in Church and State; and that the conflict which Luther began was bound to work itself out as it is culminating now. Over

against the autocracy of princes and the rigidity of Romanism, what Luther's Protestantism insisted on was the social fact that the lust of temporal power spoils the Church and robs her of her spiritual crown; that variety of organization is God's way for man; and that World Domination is not to be for any one organization, civic or ecclesiastical, in which fallible man partakes,—Church or State, autocratic or democratic. "The powers that be are ordained of God;" but the Almighty hath set bounds to them, that no one of them shall cover the earth. God has made the powers that be many, not one, because God alone is One, and He is over all, blessed forever. When Luther at Wittenberg burned the Pope's bull, this was what was in his heart of hearts; and to-day once more it is in the heart of the Allies contending against Germany, with the Pope behind the Kaiser, in that both Pope and Kaiser wish to dominate the world. And when the cause of internationalism has downed the dominating Imperialism which ruins both States and Churches, I believe that we shall be nearer the time when the Christian Churches will be ready for Intercommunion.

Furthermore, as part of this aspect of the Reformation, though of far wider reach, across the perspective of four hundred years we now can see that Luther's Protestantism was a reassertion of what Christ Himself stood for when, after His Crucifixion, He presented to His disciples the same Body, and yet not the same, but transformed. Thereby our Lord set forth and emphasized His doctrine of the Church: that that too is a living Body, not static, but capable of constant transformation. Like pagan ecclesiasticism, Christian ecclesiasticism is prone to ignore this or deny it, preferring to act as if the present inherited and given form of the organism were so sacrosanct as to be incapable of change. Whereas, if an organism is vital, it must be changing, going on unto perfection. If we know of Divine right in this world, organized life has it,—civic and eccle-

siastical no less than individual bodies; for vitality is of God. But if an historic form of organic life started with this right, this *ipso facto* included and presupposed the Divine right to live by transformation. Great stress must be laid on the form of the Church for the time being, for we know no life that is not attached to form. But though the form is valuable for the time being, part of its value consists in its capacity to be reconstituted when the occasion therefor arises. This was Christ's contention against the Jewish hierarchy; it was Peter's, when he overrode the early Christian reactionaries and induced them to let in the Gentiles on different terms; it was Paul's contention against Peter himself, when Peter vacillated about it; and it was Luther's contention against the rigidity of Rome. But again in our day in every Protestant Church, hardly less than in the Roman Catholic, there are signs of the same unwillingness to let the Holy Spirit keep the Church alive by transformation: the old customary form must be adhered to as sacrosanct. So looking backward is too much the order of the day, even where a reunion of the separated Churches is advocated and there are conferences on Faith and Order. The conferences are helpful; but can anyone imagine that much will come of them unless and until every branch of the Church,—Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Anglican and Protestant Episcopalian, Methodist, Presbyterian, Congregationalist, Baptist, or whatever—makes at least this preliminary admission: that every existing form of Church organization possesses the inherent, God-given capacity of transformation which belongs to vitality, as such? When Christ presented to His astonished disciples His own risen Body transfigured,—the same, yet not the same—He was reinforcing all His previous arguments as to His Body the Church—the extension of the Incarnation. Of the one, no less than of the other, He would have us know that

it "doth not continue in one stay." No human being can forecast what the transfigured Church shall look like, but even now the process is going on. He that hath eyes to see, let him see. From moment to moment it is, and always has been, with the Church as with our physical bodies; the transformation is occasioned by the reaction of an interior, vital energy to an exterior force of circumstances. And the interior energy of the Church is the Spirit of the Living Christ, "Who maketh all things new." For any present form of organization to attempt to withstand permanently the combined force of outward circumstances and the upward push of its own God-given vitality, is to waste away.

Have we not a premonition of this in that God-given entity which each of us knows best in all the world, our individual body? Unquestionably the form is associated with the life for the time being, and has much to do with its expression; though every material particle is exchanged for new matter every few years, and from the germ in the mother's womb on through childhood and manhood our friends notice the subtile signs of change. The human organism reacts to circumstances as the Churches do from age to age. And as for our instinctive clinging to our present forms of ecclesiastical organization or polity,—our inveterate refusal to recognize the alterations that, in spite of us, are going on in every Church throughout the world—how like this is to our devotion to the bodily form of ourselves and of our friends! As Shakespeare says in Hamlet, "What a piece of work is man! in form and moving how express and admirable! the beauty of the world! the paragon of animals!" Our affection and imagination fasten to the charm of bodily form as if it were not fleeting before our very eyes, and as if every little while we were not obliged to bury the forms of our beloved and abandon them as dust to dust. Yet the wise do not allow their affection to be

inextricably identified with the decaying object of it. Even on pagan lips the cry "*anima vagula!*" (O passing soul) bore testimony to man's indomitable conviction that the soul is on a journey, and endures the transformation.

> "Life! we've been long together
> Through pleasant and through cloudy weather. . . .
> Say not Good Night,—but in some brighter clime
> Bid me Good Morning.'"*

And Christians who, by the published and amply witnessed experiences of Jesus Himself, are absolutely assured of the persistence of human organic life beyond the grave, should be thereby made all the readier to admit the ecclesiastical consequences of this. If in the case of individuals the precious and peculiar organization of our present bodies, though intimately valuable, is not invaluable or essential, Christian Churchmen ought to be prepared for a similar admission in the case of the Body of the Church, or, as we term it, "ecclesiastical polity." For it is with evident intention that the New Testament speaks of the Church as the Body of Christ. Martin Luther, in spite of his mistakes, was the Providential instrument of one such transformation when, against his will, he was excommunicated from the Romish Communion, and "went out, not knowing whither he went." Luther was unexpectedly compelled to translate what St. Paul had said about individuals and apply it to the Christian Church at large: "God giveth it a body as it hath pleased Him, and to every seed his own body;" "and though our outward man perish, yet the inward man is renewed day by day." Nor had very many years passed over the Protestant Churches before the wise Anglican, Richard Hooker, in his monumental study of Church polity, remarked, "Nature tendeth to validities." And soon afterward the High Church Anglican, Bishop Andrewes, wrote: "Though our (Episcopal) government be of Divine right, it follows not that a Church cannot stand

*Mrs. Barbauld. "Life, I know not what thou art."

without it. He must needs be stone-blind that sees not Churches standing without it." More recently the late Bishop John Wordsworth (not to mention other authorities) wrote a book to the same effect. Lately Bishop Gore, the respected and admired Anglican representative of the High Church party, which has come to be more ultra than Bishop Andrewes was—Bishop Gore, of Oxford, has found himself compelled by his own erudition to make, in effect, the same admission that Bishop Andrewes and Bishop John Wordsworth did, and say: "Christ did not legislate for His Church." That is, Christ left it to His Church, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, to legislate for herself, allowing the Body to be transformed by its own vitality. This was the view of the Church's opportunity and duty that the Church of England took as her share in the Reformation. She did not follow Luther slavishly, nor endorse all his utterances and acts. But she seized her own opportunity to promote a transformation of the ecclesiastical body in England. The Church of England did not begin sectarianism: she accepted the situation which Roman excommunication thrust upon her, as it did upon Luther; but she endeavored to lessen the extravagances of sectarianism with a view to true Catholicism.

Even so Martin Luther did not create sectarianism. Long before his day, as the Church grew, there were divisions without intercommunion. But Luther and the Church of England, each according to their lights, in refusing to be like the Roman hierarchy and like many a pagan hierarchy—in refusing to insist that a given organization cannot go on living if its form be changed; cannot be transformed under the Providence of God, as every earthly body, Christ's included, has been—Luther and the Church of England, so far from paving the way by this for more and more sectarianism, were making ready for a time when a reunion of the Churches might

come to pass in a transformed Christendom. In this respect their influence may be compared to the probable result of this world-war, whereby mere Nationalism is sooner or later likely to be transformed into Internationalism. As Internationalism is being revealed as the way out for narrow-minded nationalities, so little by little it is being borne in on the Churches that the fact that a given form of polity can be proved to be original and primitive does not necessarily prove that it was meant to last unchanged. This, to the robust faith of a true Christian, depends on whether the Lord Christ legislated that the original form must not be altered and allowed to grow; which is precisely what we do not find stated in the New Testament. Indeed, when one thinks of it, it is remarkable that, in full view of the devotion of both the pagan and the Jewish hierarchies to their ecclesiastical forms, there is no record that our Lord laid much stress on the particular form which His Church should assume. It appears that He took no pains to establish a form for His Church by legislation—so much so that to this day truth-loving scholars, even among Romanists, are in dispute as to what actually was the most primitive form of the Christian polity.

Therefore in this respect Luther's ultimate influence accords with the inspired utterance of St. Paul: "We sow not the body that shall be, but bare grain. God giveth it a body." And Luther's protest against the rigidity of Rome echoed the passage where the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews condemns the stiffness of the Jewish Christians out of the mouth of their own prophet: "In that he saith a new covenant, he hath made the first old. But that which waxeth aged is ready to vanish away." If, then, Christ Himself left no explicit directions about ecclesiastical forms, but left that to be settled by the first Christians themselves as a body indwelt by the Holy Spirit, there is nothing to show that

Christ did not intend that it should be likewise in later crises of His Church.

I have hardly a moment left for the final point in which Luther's experience duplicated that of Paul and the primitive Christians, and anticipated ours. There were serious schisms, differences of form and differences of doctrine, within the Christian fold of Paul's time, just as there are now. And because of these some good people ware scandalized and some confused, and some prevented from joining the Church at all. The same thing stung Luther's heart, until, in a moment of discouragement, he wrote down in his diary: "I tell my God, if He will have His Church, He must govern it Himself. I can't do it. And if I thought I could, I should be one of the proudest asses under heaven." Paul's letters now and then express much the same discouragement. Yet, like Luther, Paul finally rose to the occasion, and said: "Some indeed preach Christ of envy and strife; some also of good will. . . . What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice. For me to live is Christ." In these modern days we too for our part are learning that if once men be brought to know Christ, and to feel His drawing, Christ exercises His own influence. Such likewise was Luther's experience. So he died in peace. Ending his earthly life at Eisleben, where he had been brought up, Luther gathered up his strength and was overheard to utter this parting prayer:

"Heavenly Father; eternal, merciful God: Thou hast revealed to me Thy dear Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. Him I have taught. Him I have confessed. Him I love as my Saviour and Redeemer, Whom the wicked persecute, dishonor, and reprove. Take my poor soul up to Thee."

NOTES AND COMMENTS

REGARDING the World Conference on Faith and Order, under bulletin number 15, the following announcement is made:

As previous bulletins have reported, the work of issuing invitations to the various communions throughout the world to coöperate in the World Conference on Faith and Order has been prosecuted as far as the war permitted. Sixty-one such commissions have now been appointed, representing almost all the leading Communions of the world and, more or less completely, every country in the world except the continent of Europe.

The Commission of the American Episcopal Church had expected to send a deputation in August, 1914, to explain the matter to the European Communions, including the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox, and ask their coöperation. The war prevented the deputation from sailing, but correspondence has been continued and extended with eminent individuals in every country which could be reached, and very many cordial letters of approval have been received.

It had seemed possible to send deputations last summer—one to Russia and one to Rome—each to approach such Communions as it could reach in other countries. The deputation appointed for Russia was in position to act quickly and had, as its members thought, arranged for their passports and had engaged passage, but, at the last moment, the State Department expressed a strong wish that the deputation should postpone its visit, for fear that it might be misunderstood as having some pacifist motive which might interfere with the prosecution of the war. At that time, it was supposed that the two deputations should start as nearly simultaneously as possible, in order to ensure that all the Communions which could be reached should be invited as nearly simultaneously as possible. At the time of the suggestion by the State Department that the Russian visit should be postponed, Dr. John R. Mott was on his way back from Russia, having been sent there by the President of the United States as a member of a mission to express the sympathy of the United States with the new Russian Democracy. Dr. Mott was seen as soon as he arrived in Washington, and reported that he had found the World Conference very generally understood in Russia and meeting with cordial approval, many eminent members of the Russian Church having assured him of the coöperation of that Church as soon as the official invitation could be issued. Dr. Mott, however, advised waiting for some months until the Russian Church had settled some, at least, of the numerous and difficult problems arising out of its new relation to the State, but he was quite confident there would be no jealousy on the part of the Russian Church if the formal invitation were issued first to Rome. The visit to Russia has therefore been postponed.

It seemed wise to write to Rome to a very eminent Roman Catholic, who is deeply interested in the question of reunion, and who is familiar with the World Conference movement and thoroughly in sympathy with it, and ask his private and unofficial advice as to whether or not it would be expedient for the deputation to proceed to Rome the coming winter or next spring. That letter has been written and is perhaps now reaching Italy, but an answer can hardly be expected much before a month or more.

So far as possible, correspondence will be continued with Roman Cath-

olics in various parts of the world and, especially, in Italy with members of the Russian and other Eastern Orthodox Churches, and of Protestant Communions in all the countries which can be reached, where Commissions have not yet been appointed.

The most significant session at the recent General Convention of the Disciples of Christ in Kansas City, Missouri, was that devoted to Christian unity on Sunday evening. On the Saturday evening before a banquet was tendered the guests at one of the hotels. These were: Rev. William H. Black, D.D., Marshall, Mo., chairman; Rev. Harry C. Rogers, D.D., Kansas City, Mo.; Rev. George P. Baity, D.D., Kansas City, Mo., and Rev. William R. King, D.D., St. Louis, Mo., official representatives from the Presbyterian Church, from which household the Disciples came; Hon. H. M. Beardsley, Kansas City, Mo., chairman; Rev. Ross W. Sanderson, Lawrence, Kan., and Rev. Stephen R. Butcher, Leavenworth, Kan., official representatives of the Congregationalists, with whom the Disciples have so much in common in origin and aims, and Rev. Frank C. Coffin, D.D., Albany, New York, official representative from the American Christian Convention, with a part of which body the Disciples once had a common fellowship. Fraternal greetings were borne from these deputations to the Disciples at both the banquet and the Sunday evening session, closing with a remarkable address by the Right Rev. Charles P. Anderson, D.D., of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Chicago, on Christian unity. Previous to this meeting the Disciples had sent official representatives to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., meeting in Dallas, Texas, and also to the National Council of the Congregational Churches, meeting in Columbus, Ohio.

When the whole Church begins to exchange fraternal delegates, making it among the most important items on the programme of its national gatherings, we will have gone a long way toward definite coöperation and unity. Why should not every national gathering of Christians, irrespective of name and creed, ask for official representatives from other Christian bodies, as well as what is being done among the Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Christians and Disciples? By this method, slow as it may appear, the way is being paved for confidence, toleration, patience and love. These will be the chief elements entering into the unity of the divided Church of God.

Rev. Alexander McCallum, Wesley Church, Melbourne, Secretary of the General Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia, sends a very interesting set of resolutions passed recently by that Conference and writes the following letter:

I greatly appreciate the spirit of THE QUARTERLY. It deals with the question of unity in such a sane and practical way and makes one hopeful for the future. At the recent Conference of the Methodist Church of Australasia we carried resolutions with respect to Church union and also with reference to the Commission on Faith and Order. The general resolutions are inclosed. They point to a more immediate action on the part of the Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches, but the terms

are made broad enough for any parties to meet. The fact that so many Christian people are becoming conscious of what disunion means is surely a promise of better days ahead and there are many praying in Australia for the coming of a spirit amongst Christian people which will make us conscious of our actual one-ness.

The resolutions are as follows:

(1) That this Conference gives devout thanks to the Great Head of the Church for the spirit of unity which is drawing the various sections of the Christian Church into closer fellowship and service. The Conference again declares its conviction that a union of the Churches would be in accordance with the will of God and for the advancement of His Kingdom.

(2) The Conference therefore appoints a committee which, in consultation with committees appointed for the purpose by other Churches, shall prepare a basis of union, and take such other steps as may be deemed desirable to bring about a federation or organic union of kindred Churches.

(3) That in the meantime, and whilst continuing negotiations, it be an instruction to such committee to secure without delay a basis of coöperation for joint action in relation to aggressive evangelism, Sunday-school and kindred matters, the combating of public evils, and religious ministrations in sparsely populated districts, and other matters in which it is found possible to take united action.

(4) That the Annual Conference be directed to appoint a committee, and that any basis of union provisionally agreed upon, and other important decisions arrived at by the united committee or by this Conference committee, shall be submitted to the various Conference committees on Church union, and to each of the Conferences in their annual sessions.

(5) That before any basis of union has been finally agreed to by the Annual Conferences, it shall be submitted by each Conference to the Quarterly Meetings and District Synods within its boundaries, and that a report of the vote of such Quarterly Meetings and Synods, together with the resolution of the Annual Conferences on the question, shall be furnished to the General Conference Committee, in order that such committee may present its report to the next General Conference.

(6) That a copy of these resolutions shall be forwarded to the presiding officer of the chief court of all the negotiating churches concerned.

(7) That the committee should consist of nineteen members, with the president of the General Conference as an ex-officio member. That seven of the members be chosen from the state of Victoria, seven from New South Wales, two from South Australia, and one each from Queensland and Western Australia.

(8) Committee shall consist of the President (Rev. J. E. Carruthers, D.D.) (ex-officio), Revs. B. J. Meek, W. H. Beale, J. G. Wheen, Hons. W. Robson, M.L.C. and J. Garrard, Messrs. H. M. Hawkins and P. N. Slade (New South Wales); Revs. A. M'Callum, E. H. Sugden, M.A., Litt.D., A. T. Holden, B.A., and J. W. Grove, M.A., LL.B., Messrs. W. B. M'Cutcheon, F. J. Cato and J. Hocking, M.A. (Victoria and Tasmania); Rev. G. Hall and Mr. A. Langsford (South Australia) Rev. Dr. Youngman (Queensland); Mr. J. W. Langsford (Western Australia).

Rev. A. T. Holden, B.A., Convener.

At the instance of the Commission on Comity, Federation and Unity of the Congregational Churches, the following declaration was adopted by the recent National Council of Congregational Churches, meeting in Columbus, Ohio, and calls for a response from other Commissions:

Overshadowed by the vast responsibility thrown upon the Church of God in this day of judgment of modern civilization, but believing that one of the greater works of faith promised by the Lord may be done in the coming days, we, representatives of the Congregational Churches of the United States in National Council assembled, would make the following declaration concerning the obligation of the Church to make Christianity regnant throughout the world after the war.

Upon the Churches as Churches there will not be laid directly the responsibilities of the State in negotiating the terms of peace; but directly when the war ends will rest upon the Churches of all lands the supreme obligation of making civilization so truly and thoroughly Christian that henceforth only a minimum of force may be needed to secure a maximum of peace. Preparedness for this work should not be delayed. To begin even to do it, when the end of the war opens the world-wide opportunity, will require of all the Churches united counsels and far-reaching, strategic use of their allied forces. No one Church, however powerful, is equal to this stupendous task.

In view, therefore, of this test in the near future of the efficiency of organized Christianity for the sake of the Kingdom of God, we would resolve and declare:

First: That with our fellow-believers in other communions, humbling ourselves before God, we would confess and put from us any aloofness, unteachableness, or divisive sinfulness, which render the churches inefficient and would leave them incapable of answering as one body the providential call of the age about to come.

Second: As the people of this country are now freely and fearlessly putting aside many traditions, privileges, private interests and personal rights, if they stand in the way of economic and military efficiency for the war; so likewise as Congregationalists, in our liberty of the Spirit, we hold ourselves in readiness to put behind us whatever in coöperation with other Communions may prevent or hinder the organizing for utmost efficiency the religious forces of the United States in the name of Christ for the world.

Third: We would approve the work already carried forward by the Federal Council of Churches for coöperation in Christian work, the success of which opens the way for further and more intimate unity. We would likewise approve and support the commissions and conferences of many Churches in our own and other lands in the endeavor to find or to make some way out of the divisive differences among the Churches and ministries, which on all sides are more and more felt to be intolerable. We would express further our appreciation of the work and the vision of our own Board of Foreign Missions in its appeal throughout its world-wide field for a "United Church for the United Kingdom of God." We welcome and would respond to the call which it makes especially to the Churches of our own country for a Holy Alliance "to make democracy safe for the world." We would place on record our acknowledgment of the heroic fidelity of many of our missionaries amid scenes of awful tragedy.

Fourth: In order that nothing may be found lacking on our part, whenever opportunity may arise during the coming two years before the next meeting of the National Council, we do hereby authorize and enjoin the Executive Committee, our several commissions, and particularly the Commission on Federation, Comity and Unity, so far as in them lies, to seek the peace of the Churches, and to do whatsoever they may find occasion to do in order that the many churches of our own country may become one Christian power to overcome the world. We devoutly pray that through the trial, as by fire of modern civilization, as in the early days of the suffering and triumphal Church, there may prevail among all

the Churches the common consciousness of the one people of God, that henceforth the peace of God may abide as a reality on the earth.

One of the most important documents sent out in recent years to the Churches in America is that regarding the joint ordination or consecration of the chaplains in the army and navy, "sent forth with whatsoever authority and grace the whole Church of God may confer, bearing no mark upon them but the sign of the Cross." It bears the following signatures: Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D., New Haven, Conn., chairman, to whom all correspondence should be addressed; Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D., Baltimore; Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Baltimore; Rev. G. Glenn Atkins, D.D., Detroit, Mich.; Rev. James L. Barton, D.D., Boston; Rev. William E. Barton, D.D., Chicago; Hon. H. M. Beardsley, Kansas City; William L. Beardsley, New Haven, Conn.; Nolan R. Best, New York City; Rev. Hugh Birckhead, D.D., Baltimore; Dean L. J. Birney, D.D., Boston; President William H. Black, D.D., Marshall, Mo.; Rev. Nehemiah Boynton, D.D., Brooklyn; Rev. A. W. Bradford, Rutland, Vt.; President M. A. Brannon, D.D., Beloit, Wis.; Rev. H. A. Bridgman, D.D., Boston; Dean Charles R. Brown, D.D., New Haven, Conn.; Rev. John W. Buckham, D.D., Berkeley, Cal.; Rev. F. W. Burnham, LL.D., Cincinnati; President M. L. Burton, D.D., Minneapolis; Rev. Samuel C. Bushnell, Arlington, Mass.; Rev. S. Parkes Cadman, D.D., Brooklyn; Rev. N. M. Calhoun, Orange, Conn.; Rev. C. F. Carter, Hartford, Conn.; Rev. A. N. Coats, D.D., Hartford, Conn.; Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, D.D., New York City; President Donald J. Cowling, D.D., Northfield, Minn.; President Ozora S. Davis, D.D., Chicago; Rev. William H. Day, D.D., Bridgeport, Conn.; Rev. R. C. Denison, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. H. P. Dewey, D.D., Minneapolis; Rev. Charles A. Dinsmore, D.D., Waterbury, Conn.; Rev. Charles A. Eaton, D.D., New York City; Rev. Arthur T. Fowler, North Orange, N. J.; Rev. Edward A. George, Ithaca, N. Y.; Rev. Washington Gladden, D.D., Columbus, Ohio; Rev. Frederick W. Greene, Middletown, Conn.; President James B. Gregg, D.D., Pittsfield, Mass.; Rev. Henry O. Hannon, Holyoke, Mass.; Prof. E. Y. Hincks, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.; Professor Arthur S. Hoyt, D.D., Auburn, N. Y.; Rev. Finis S. Idleman, D.D., New York City; Rev Charles E. Jefferson, D.D., New York City; Professor Rufus M. Jones, Haverford, Pa.; Rev. Frederick D. Kershner, LL.D., Cincinnati; Bishop Morris W. Leibert, D.D., New York City; Rev. Frederick Lent, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. John N. Lewis, Waterbury, Conn.; Rev. Frederick Lynch, D.D., New York City; President H. N. MacCracken, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; His Honor Justice Maclaren, LL.D., Toronto, Can.; Burton Mansfield, New Haven, Conn.; President A. C. McGiffert, D.D., New York City.; Rev. Randolph H. McKim, D.D., Washington, D. C.; Rev. Stewart Means, D.D., New Haven, Conn.; Rev. William P. Merrill, D.D., New York City; Professor Warren J. Moulton, D.D., Bangor, Me.; President C. S. Nash, D.D., Berkeley, Cal.; Rev. George L. Paine, New Haven, Conn.; Rev. F. L.

Palmer, Stillwater, Minn.; Rev. Edward Parsons, Berkeley, Cal.; Rev. Harold Pattison, D.D., New York City; President Stephen B. L. Penrose, D.D., Walla Walla, Wash.; George W. Pepper, LL.D., Philadelphia; Professor J. W. Platner, D.D., Cambridge, Mass.; Rev. A. P. Pratt, D.D., Greenfield, Mass.; Rev. I. O. Rankin, Boston; Rev. J. B. Remensnyder, D.D., New York City; Judge Henry W. Rogers, LL.D., New Haven, Conn.; Rev. W. C. Rowell, Beloit, Wis.; Rev. Charles C. Scoville, New Haven, Conn.; Professor R. N. Smith, Northampton, Mass.; President J. Ross Stevenson, D.D., Princeton, N. J.; Rev. Anson P. Stokes, D.D., New Haven, Conn.; Rev. John W. Suter, Boston; Hon. Z. T. Sweeney, LL.D., Columbus, Ind.; Rev. Lucius H. Thayer, Portsmouth, N. H.; Samuel Thorne, Jr., New York City; President W. J. Tucker, D.D., Hanover, N. H.; Professor Williston Walker, D.D., New Haven, Conn.; Lucien C. Warner, LL.D., New York City; Rev. Francis B. Whitcomb, Watertown, Conn.; Bishop Charles D. Williams, D.D., Detroit, Mich.

The document is as follows:

To Our Fellow-Believers in All the Churches; Greetings.

The present crisis confronts the Church with the possibility of coming forth from the war either with a diminished or a vaster power. To-day the Churches must face realities. A divided Church cannot stand.

To-day everywhere the people are combining their industries to make the allied nations one mighty power in the war. Even on the lower plane of economics the Churches are not uniting to save waste as in many places they might do. How many tons of coal and units of electricity might be saved if thin congregations in large edifices should consent this winter to worship together?

Far more than this: to-day the Young Men's Christian Association represents Christianity before the world. The many Churches stand as an unorganized, scattered line of support behind its well organized line of volunteers. As they go forward the separate Church-units are not in position to let the world know that behind them stands the reserve power of the whole Church of God. To-day some of our ministers at the front, forgetting the denominational names of the Churches that sent them, on battlefields and in hospitals are working side by side as servants and priests of God. At home they are held apart.

To-day the government of the United States is apportioning chaplains among the different denominations. The Red Cross only for our charity; our denominational names and churchly vestments for our religion!

These things ought not so to be. The crisis of Christianity requires the subordination of all things divisive. Without prejudice to existing personal relations or official fidelities, the whole Church is called to-day to make one sacrificial offering of all things held to be of value in one great venture of faith for God. We should take counsel not of our fears but of our hopes, as did our fathers before us. To-day our fears may be our disloyalties.

Bishops, clergymen, laymen—shall we loiter in the way, disputing about many things, when in the suffering of the world our Lord is crucified afresh for the sin of modern civilization? The hour commands unity. By some decisive act our faith in it should be made fact. That might be done if, for example, as a war measure we should put in

cantonments, in regiments and on battleships chaplains and ministers, from whatever Church they may come, commissioned not by their own communion only, but by joint ordination or consecration sent forth with whatsoever authority and grace the whole Church of God may confer, bearing no mark upon them but the sign of the Cross. At some single point of vital contact—that or something better than that—the Church might act as one.

Something must be made visible fact of unity to-day, if the Church—the one Church of the many Churches, the only Church which the Lord Himself had faith enough in God to pray for—is to become to-morrow the power of God to save the world. This cannot be too long postponed. These times require quick decisions. Can we suffer the Churches to-day to forget that before the week of His passion our Lord gave the barren fig tree but one year more in which to bear fruit or be cut down? This parable is for the Church now.

Therefore we, the undersigned, representing different communions, lay before you this appeal for action, asking for response and for such suggestions as may seem to you timely.

The Disciples of Christ in England have been two bodies for some years, the older body, and distinctively English, known as Churches of Christ, and the other, somewhat American, known as Disciples of Christ. These have recently effected a union under the name of Churches of Christ. Mr. James Marsden, writing of it, says:

You will also be glad to hear that we have had a preliminary meeting with representatives of the Scotch Baptist Churches in North Wales, which was a very cordial and satisfactory meeting, and we trust will ultimately lead to union. We are also in communication with the Welsh Baptist Churches, a much larger body, and are expecting a conference to be fixed at an early date. If these examples mature we hope to interest several other bodies before we feel our preliminary work is accomplished. You will see from this that we are doing preparatory work, in this country, for the time when your movement will appeal to us on this side for a union of Christians, on the lines revealed in the Scriptures to be the Lord's will concerning such union.

Another interesting union is ready to be consummated between the Free Church of England, which was founded in 1844, and the Reformed Episcopal Church, which had its beginning in America in 1873, its English branch being established in 1877. These two Communions are the same in doctrine and practise and have the same order of the ministry. It is proposed that on and after January 1, 1918, the two Churches unite for all administrative purposes under constitutions, canons, or by-laws to be drawn up by comparison of such canons and by-laws as are at present existing. A General Synod will be the supreme authority under the title of the Free Reformed Episcopal Church of England, and the country will be divided in dioceses for the purpose of episcopal administration. The Book of Common Prayer will be revised suitable to its worship, sacraments and ordinances.

Rev. R. Sykes Shaw, D.D., General Secretary of the General Presbyterian Alliance, Edinburgh, Scotland, sends the following clipping relative to the annual meeting of the Christian Unity Association of Scotland:

The annual meeting and conference of the Christian Unity Association of Scotland was held in the Library Hall of the New College, Edinburgh. The Rev. Dr. James Robertson, Whittingehame, chairman of the Association, presided, and there was a good attendance representative of the different Christian denominations.

The Rev. Dr. Robert W. Weir, the interim secretary, submitted the report, which stated that the membership was now 191, and that 41 new members had been admitted. Reference was made to the losses sustained through death, including Professor MacEwen and the Rev. G. L. Pagan. Dr. MacEwen, it was stated, had been the mover in forming the Association, and was its secretary from its inauguration till shortly before his death.

In moving the adoption of the report, Professor Cooper, the Moderator of the Assembly of the Church of Scotland, said the Association had already accomplished good work, and they had great hopes that still greater things would yet be done. They did not despise the day of small things, but the day of big things was coming, and it was not only in Scotland that Christian people were earnestly looking forward to a greater measure of unity. A great work was going on in America preparing for a conference on Christian unity. The publications regarding that conference gave a glimpse beyond the veil of what was going on in Russia. One of the immediate things that had followed the Revolution there had been the desire to heal the schisms which had long vexed the Church of Russia. Divisions in that Church had been, might he say, even more absurd than had been the case in Scotland, and they had certainly been brought about over much more trifling matters. There was a great movement in Russia. Then there were Christians in America who were feeling their way, and they knew that in Ireland—he had been a witness of it himself—and in England the desire for unity was growing in a very remarkable fashion. They could congratulate themselves as an Association not only on their continued existence, but on their continual growth; and they grew very happily, for they saw from the report that both ministers and laymen of the various Churches in Scotland were coming in to membership.

The Rev. Dr. Sclater, in seconding, spoke of some of his recent experiences in France. They were all in complete agreement out there, he said, that their divisions were unhappy and in themselves evil, and in so far as they could be removed that there was an immediate clamant Christian duty before them. When the war was over, and the very grave moral problems arose that would arise in connection with society as a whole, it was extremely desirable that there should be a single front from the Christian community. One of the reasons why their social life had been so slow in developing in a Christian way was that the Christian people, when trying to express themselves as a moral force in the land, had been at such extreme pains to contradict each other. He had been given a special piece of work in France to try to develop a corporate system within the Y. M. C. A. between the clergy and ministers of the various Churches, and the whole gamut of their differences was there represented. It was found, however, that they could work together, on terms, that each of them was to be loyal to his own Church, but in such a loyalty that he did not attack the Church of his brethren. What they really said was, "You are wrong, my dear chap, and you cannot help being wrong, but God bless you; carry on, and we will make up our differences some day:" He would like to see the Association doing something at once in regard to inter-Communion. That

came up again and again in France, and it was a matter of great importance that witness should be given before all the soldiers that they could meet together at the Lord's Table. He might say that when the backs of the ecclesiastical authorities were turned there was inter-Communion. He had received Communion along with a leaven of Wesleyans, Independents, Baptists, and Anglicans, and he had given the Communion to Anglicans. By getting rid of that difficulty, they would go far to bridge the gulf and heal the divisions that existed among them.

The Committee elected Sir Andrew Fraser as chairman, and the Bishop of Brechin vice-chairman, and the Rev. Dr. Weir secretary for the ensuing year.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A STIMULUS TO THOUGHT AND PRAYER

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is received by me regularly and is much appreciated. I find in it much stimulus to thought and prayer for that which the world awaits—the unity of all true believers in our Divine Lord and Master. I think the thousands who read it might be asked to secure one reader.

Yours faithfully in Christ Jesus,

Cecil H. Grafton.

Bishop's Lodge, Grafton, Australia.

(The suggestion of the Bishop of Grafton is very timely and for the purpose of disseminating Christian unity thought it is earnestly hoped that our readers will seek to make the suggestion practical.—The Editor.)

THE IDEALS OF THE MASSES

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— The editorial found in the last issue of THE QUARTERLY has these words: "The ideals for Christian unity must become the ideals of the masses." God bless those words! All our discussions about unity do not reach the masses, and if they did they would not be understood. Plain, clear language is needed. How wonderfully plain Jesus spoke! Too many are filled with vanity when they speak or write. Unity in God's Church is needed if the Gospel is to have power in the future. Unity is needed if future wars are to be prevented. Your words are true—"Had the Church been united and lived up to the standard of her Lord, this war would never have been." Kings, etc., must be made humble. Christians must bow their proud heads under the yoke of Christ. There is no salvation for this world except in a fervent united Christianity.

Yours for unity,

Raymond Vernimont,
Catholic Priest.

Denton, Texas.

THE REMOVING OF PREJUDICE AND PASSION

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I receive THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY and am very glad to get it. I am sure it is doing good in keeping alive the desire for unity and in creating an atmosphere which will make reunion possible. I am also very much interested in the Commission on Faith and Order of the Protestant Episcopal Church. You in America seem to be working on the right line and making it possible for pride, prejudice and passion to be removed. Surely in some way the Holy Spirit will bring us all together as one of the results of the tribulation of these days. The problems of the future are so many and so vast and the importance of rebuilding our civilization on the basis of Christian Truth is so great, that

one hopes and prays for such unity that the world may be forced to listen to the voice of the Church and believe that God sent His Son to save the world. How it will come about we may not know, but the sorrows and suffering will not have been in vain if one result is unity. May you have every blessing and the help and guidance of the Holy Spirit in all you are doing to make unity possible.

Ever yours sincerely,
Henry, Bishop of Carpentaria.

Bishop's House, Thursday Island, Australia.

A SIGNIFICANT CONTRIBUTION

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I value THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY highly and appreciate its significant contribution to the great cause to which it is devoted. It seems to me that your handling of the programme is sympathetic, tolerant and catholic. I am grateful for what it says.

Yours sincerely,
Ozora S. Davis.

President's Office, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

GREATLY RELISHED

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— No periodical which comes to my desk is as greatly relished as THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY. It feeds my passion for Church union as nothing else. God bless you in the effort you are making to ripen the whole Church for the possible one-ness for which Jesus prayed. I am,

Yours most cordially,
Charles W. Recard.

First Congregational Church, Canton, Ohio.

REVIVAL THE WAY TO UNION

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I read THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY with great interest and that you may continue to send it without interruption, I inclose a P. O. money order for ten dollars.

It is difficult for one who has been unable to take any part in Church work for some time to discern clearly the signs of the times, but some things are clear:—(1) That there is more union than is sometimes thought already. I have been a Wesleyan local preacher for forty years. When in active service I preached for every evangelical church, and found the gospel I preached in one was blessed to all. Hundreds of my brethren have had the same experience. To realize this is a great gain. (2) All over the country small groups of men are meeting, trying to learn the Lord's will and way to union. (3) A chief difficulty is to find how Episcopalians and non-Episcopalians can unite. The more sincerely both parties believe the positive truth in their creeds, the more difficult the problem. (4) I am increasingly convinced that union is not the way to revival so much, but that revival will bring about union. That is why I am so grateful that in all countries, impressed, even appalled by the horrors of war, and the inability of the churches to win the multitudes to Christ, so many are looking for another "day of the Lord." He made

and redeemed the world; "great voices" in heaven proclaim that the kingdom of the world has become His. He will not leave us alone; even in the war He is coming. So we earnestly pray, "Even so come quickly, Lord Jesus."

Yours sincerely,

Tilden J. Bisseker.

Wesleyan Methodist Conference of England, Scotland and Wales, Birmingham, England.

CHRISTIAN UNION MORE THAN EMOTION AND TALK

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I congratulate you upon the last issue of THE QUARTERLY. I cannot but think that Christians need to be taught that Christian union is something very real. It is much more than a little emotion and considerable talk. There must be, it seems to me, a great deal of actual love, fraternity, mutual confidence, toleration and liberty. Something is lacking, I think, if we cannot worship, commune and work together. I am,

Sincerely and cordially,

Arthur E. Main.

Alfred Theological Seminary, Alfred, New York.

THE LOYAL AND CATHOLIC SPIRIT OF OTHERS

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— The last number of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is a highly respectable and a thoroughly readable magazine. It is just such a publication as we are all proud to have sent out to the religious world. It also, and perhaps this is of more value to us, brings to our attention the truly loyal and catholic spirit of representatives of other communions in the matters of faith and union. It is rendering good service in having reached such a stage of success.

Very fraternally,

Allan B. Philputt.

Central Christian Church, Indianapolis, Indiana.

NECESSITY FOR GROWTH IN CHRISTLIKE SPIRIT

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— The current number of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY has duly reached me. It is true that I am intensely interested in every movement towards Christian unity, and deplore the state of things out here which seems to resemble your own. There seems to be no need and little sense for most of our present divisions. But the only cure that I can see is the growth of a more Christlike spirit than seems to be discernible in Church controversies. Human nature still cries, "I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, etc." The more one goes into the question the more the absence of a spirit of sweet reasonableness stands forth. A minimum of dogma and a maximum of charity may bring us more closely together, but one wonders sometimes whether there can ever be a general agreement about anything in this world! Believe me,

Yours very faithfully,

T. H. Wangaratta.

Bishop's Lodge, Wangaratta, Victoria, Australia.

A DEPARTMENT FOR BRIEF SUMMARIES

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— It has occurred to me that if you could have a department in THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY in which brief summaries were given of contributions made in the religious press towards the problem of Christian unity from different standpoints, it would, from my point of view, increase the value of the publication. There are many people writing and thinking on the subject at the present time, and we in England should like to be possessed more fully of what is being thought on the whole question from various points of view in the United States; not, that is to say, through long articles, such as usually from the body of the magazine, but rather by bringing from various quarters anything which is really worthy of notice on the subject. The work in connection with the Commission on the World Conference on this side of the Atlantic is going steadily forward, although I feel that, in several directions, progress is more apparent than real.

I am,
Yours very sincerely,
Henry T. Hodgkin.

Friends' Foreign Mission Association, London, England.

(This is a valuable suggestion and the editor will have to depend somewhat upon the readers of THE QUARTERLY in all parts of the world to supply such material, which will always be gladly used. In this issue we have opened a department under the title, "Notes and Comments." The Editor.)

AN EFFECTIVE WITNESS

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is the most stimulating magazine and a most effective witness to that spirit of fervent desire for unity which is happily becoming stronger and stronger among all the followers of our Blessed Lord. I welcome the coming of this magazine and gain from it much profit and inspiration.

Very sincerely yours,
Geo. Craig Stewart.

The Rectory, St. Luke's Parish, Evanston, Illinois.

THE ONLY CURE FOR DIVISION

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— The slowness by which the ulcer of division is being healed only goes to prove either the leprosy of its character or the ineffectiveness of the relief proposed. However, let us all be careful that we are not the cause of further division; that we are working not only in the spirit of Him who prayed for the spiritual unity of His followers, but also by the same Spirit for the letter or "mould of the doctrine" by which it was to be formed in the heart of each believer. By a submissive and faithful carrying out of the prescriptions of the Great Physician, and by this alone, will the healing of God's people be accomplished.

Yours in His service,
A. D. Milroy.

Brenham, Texas.

THE MYSTICAL ELEMENT IN CHRISTIANITY

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I have pleasure in saying that I regard the work of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY as of first importance in days of crisis like the present, when the Church is summoned to give of its best for the healing of the nations and the work of Christ on earth. To this great end, the object of your effort is the unity of all the churches and with this object I have the keenest sympathy, linked, as it is, with many other similar efforts all over the world. But you will, I feel sure, agree with me that great things must happen before this unity can be a realized fact and, as such, a power for righteousness in the world. Corporately and individually we must find ourselves cleansed from that which has hitherto stood in the way of this unity. Just as the forerunner of our Lord's "way" called upon men to "prepare" that "way," so now a like evangel would seem to be called for—a great preparation should even now be moving us all for what is "about to come to pass," if not by our own hands, by the "stones" that will be raised up by God for this great work, for which we may have been found "wanting."

When I ask myself what practical steps can be taken to bring about this great awakening and preparation, I find the answer difficult, and am also reminded that answers will vary with circumstances, such as prevail in different nations, groups, churches, etc. But certain things are of universal application and may therefore be universally regarded. The spirit of *penitence and prayer* is everywhere needed far more abundantly than most of us are able to discover. The promised Kingdom is "*not of this world,*" and as the Church comes into this inheritance she will find herself detached from the world even by many of the processes that are working to that end outside her own borders, and these processes will no doubt be the means of leading the Church into a greater simplicity of daily life and into the generous sharing of all God's gifts with others. The Son of God "dwells" only in those who *share* the gifts of God. But penitence and prayer and non-conformity to the world and a new social order and statesmanship raised to the highest level of international justice and order, cannot, in themselves, give us the abiding security of a Church united in aim and purpose for the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth.

This brings me to what I feel is, in short, the value of the mystical element in religion; an element which, if I am not mistaken, is in great danger of being discounted in these days—partly because so little understood and partly because the genius of all our thinking does not tend to include it in any really working theory of reform. Perhaps the men and women are being raised up, being indeed anointed in the school of suffering for this great end. It is perfectly simple when once the eye of the soul has seen it. Why should a *personal* relationship, reverent, intimate, continuous, *with Christ,* be any more difficult than the relationships which bind us to one another in hallowed human friendships? We must recover what the saints found and kept in respect of this spiritual experience. It will be cold religion, a chilly kind of unity that does not stand for this most vital and reviving influence. This it is which comes to me as the deeper element to be recognized in all our efforts for the reunion of the churches.

And one thing more to which this leads up. After all is said and done, there is God's part, God's single-handed, splendidly complete equipment of spiritual forces, working unceasingly with and without our recognition to these great ends. Is it not well for us sometimes to rest in a Divine content upon this great fact? We may worry our-

selves and others into an activity that begets nothing bigger than human ends and these are absolutely inadequate. If He "were hungry He would not tell us," and "the cattle on a thousand hills are His," "the world and the fullness thereof." He asks that we keep our "vows," and the keeping of these will give all the service from us which He needs; the rest is His own.

I close this letter with a prayer for the union of churches which I wrote for a little service recently held here by the Church of England.

Oh God, Father of all mankind, Light of the world in the face of Jesus Christ, we humbly beseech Thee to bring together in a visible unity thy children who are scattered abroad throughout all the world, that these may stand as one for the healing of the nations and the work of Christ on earth; and by the breath of Thy Spirit, blowing where it listeth, create the New Life and the larger Hope upon which this unity must rest.

Receive, we beseech Thee, our humble confession of those sins and shortcomings which have divided us amongst ourselves and from our brothers, separated us from Thyself and dimmed our vision of the Unseen, causing us to lose Thy likeness and to become conformed to the world and to the spirit of the world.

Graciously forgive us, we beseech Thee, and raise us up out of that into which we have fallen; open our eyes and our understanding that we may see the Truth in its Divine beauty and clearness, and by that Truth be set free for Thy service on earth.

Quicken us by Thy Grace, and by Thy in-shining Light overcome our darkness and unbelief and give us the faith that "overcomes the world."

As we are able to bear it, give us tidings of that which is to come—a vision of the "new Heaven" and the "new Earth" which we believe it is Thy will to create and complete when the agony and sin of this terrible world-crisis is over-past.

Make us worthy instruments in Thy hand to this great end and unite us to Thyself and to one another in Thy eternal will and purpose for all mankind, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Believe me,
Yours sincerely,
Society of Friends, Bristol, England. (Mrs.) A. W. Marsh.

IN SYMPATHY WITH THE UNION OF CHRISTENDOM

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I am in entire sympathy with the aim of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY for a union of Christendom, and I am especially pleased with the last issue. Yours very truly,

Silas Evans.
President's Office, Occidental College, Los Angeles, California.

GOOD WORK

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— You have our best wishes for the success of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY and of the good work it is doing. There is every reason to believe your management should be proud of this publication.

Yours very truly,
New Orleans, La. The Catholic Churchman.

PROGRESS TOWARD CHURCH UNION IS SLOW

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I have read THE QUARTERLY with the greatest satisfaction. It seems to me that it is the most constructive publication I have seen on what, in my judgment, is the most important subject before the Christian Church. Progress towards Church union is distressingly slow, due largely to the fact that publications such as yours reach a comparatively few people. Has it occurred to you to have a moving picture film made that will carry the lesson, indirectly at least, for Church union? There is no greater educational factor in the country to-day than the moving picture. A message in the film would reach a larger constituency than in any other way.

Yours faithfully,
J. E. McCulloch.

Southern Sociological Congress, Washington, D. C.

(If such a film could be produced the experiment as a contribution to education would be interesting for there is great need of instruction on the folly of a divided Church.—The Editor.)

FAR REACHING IN ITS PURPOSE

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I think THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY is the best of its kind published in this country. It seems to me to be conservative, yet far reaching in the expression of its main purpose and ought to appeal to all lovers of union.

Sincerely yours,
W. W. Staley.

Christian Church, Suffolk, Va.

GREATER BREADTH AND COMPREHENSIVENESS

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I appreciate THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY highly. It has seemed to me to grow in value, and particularly in its enlarged form to have greater breadth and comprehensiveness.

Sincerely yours,
Alfred Williams Anthony.

General Conference of Free Baptists, Lewiston, Maine.

DENOMINATIONAL LIFE NOT YET EXHAUSTED

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— The articles in THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY are sane, capable and interesting. I am not quite as sanguine as many of your writers are concerning the speedy reunion of Christendom, nor do I interpret quite as literally as many of them do the prayer of Christ, "that they may all be one." To my mind the main idea there is spiritual, not ecclesiastical, unity. But we have entirely too many denominations, but the great historic lines of denominational life have not yet exhausted their mission. That at least is my mind. At the same time, I look eagerly and very sympathetically toward the union of all Presbyterianism in one and all Congregationalism in one, and I am in sympathy with every prayer for Christian unity.

Sincerely yours,
Wallace Radcliffe.

The Manse, New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C.

BOOK REVIEWS

CHRISTIAN UNION IN SOCIAL SERVICE. By JOHN C. CARLILE, Author of "Life of Dr. Maclaren," "Labour Problems in the Light of the Gospel," "The Royal Life," etc., etc. With Foreword by the Right Rev., The Bishop of Croydon. London: James Clark & Co., 13 Fleet Street. 232 pages. 2/6 net.

IN the Foreword of this informing volume the Bishop of Croydon says, "We ask ourselves and our brothers in the Lord, that we shall seek in the spirit of His Cross to look at the things that divide us, and to understand them; at least to seek to see each from other's point of view; to realize that the things in which we are united, are infinitely greater than the things in which we are divided—important as these may be. In vital doctrine there may be small differences between us. Would it not be a great gain to leave the controversies for awhile, in order to unite in prayer for the Holy Spirit's guidance, and then in brotherly conference to see the great body of truth which we have in common? It will help us if we can seek the Divine help for each other. The barriers may not be as great as we suppose." Then follow ten addresses by Mr. Carlile given to conferences of clergy and ministers of all denominations in England in the hope of helping the movement for uniting the churches in the work of social reform.

It is an urgent and reasonable call to the churches—not asking them to decide what they can give up, but rather what they can take up, thereby seeking union in social service as a step to closer union. That which brought the Roman empire to seek the Lord was the disciples' consecration and brotherhood in the common ministry of doing good. The foundation then and the foundation now is Christ. Well does Mr. Carlile say, "It is too late for any one church to unchurch the others. Each shows qualities that have their origin in fellowship with the Divine Master of all." He argues that social service is not the basis of our unity, but its expression, and the book is an earnest appeal to all who are heart-sick of the sectarian strifes and are seeking to find the path to that unity for which our Lord prayed when the shadow of the cross was heavy upon His heart. Some of the chapters are: "The Condition of the Churches," "Our Common Christianity and Christian Union," "Our Common Christian Experience and Christian Union," "Church Systems in the Apostolic Age and Christian Unity," "The Unity of the Church," "Attempts to Secure Christian Union," "The Union Now Possible," etc.

He shows that Christian unity is not a matter of academic interest. It strikes at the very root of the survival of the Church, the present condition revealing a melancholy object lesson of the folly of family strife, and unfitting the Church for the urgent tasks that await it. Matters of worship are determined more by taste, temperament and training than by any

relation to vital principles. The Anglican and the Quaker may worship as they please, but beneath the forms or the lack of them there lies a unity in the motive and spirit of approach to the heavenly Father. Spiritual life through all ages is the same in its essential characteristics. Sabatier said, "The source of the Christian religion is the experience of Jesus, and a man is a Christian just to the degree in which he experiences the filial piety of Jesus."

Mr. Carlile discusses at length the Protestant Church systems—Episcopal, Presbyterian and Congregational—and he pertinently asks, "Is it necessary to select one and develop it to the exclusion of the others? May not all three have been needed to express the varied moods of the mind and to meet the temperamental needs of the people?" Since each has its root in the earliest life of the Church, he thinks it possible that each may have its contribution to make to the one Church, which may be true, for, says he, "The Church is not founded upon any one ecclesiastical system. The bond of union is not external, it is not found in authority from without, compelling uniformity, but in faith and love, manifesting themselves in a new life." This was a secret of the Church's triumph in the early years.

After discussing attempts to secure union, he sees the abolition of dissent in the repeal of the Act of Uniformity and the practise of common civilities, making impossible the amusing statement of Hugh Price Hughes to Lord Halifax and several clergymen, when he said, "The average vicar knew more about the people in Timbuctoo than about the minister of the chapel within a stone's throw of the parish church." But a new spirit is awakening. The open road to Christian reunion is the path of service for the common good. The whole book is an appeal to concede to the other the right to work in holy fellowship for the good of all. It is finely said—clear, strong and irenic.

NEW TESTAMENT NAMES. A Study of Various Scriptural Appellations Used to Designate the Followers of Christ. By M. B. Ryan. Cincinnati: The Standard Publishing Company. 209 pages. $1.25 net.

Amid the multiplicity of names worn by the followers of Christ in these days it is refreshing to find a book pleading for those New Testament names such as "disciples," "friends," "Christians," "saints," "children," "brethren" and "servants," as well as the collective designations "the Church," "the Church of Christ" and "the Church of God." Back of these terms are experiences mightier than the names, without which the names are meaningless. This volume is a reverent study of their meaning as a contribution to a larger appreciation of our heritage in Christ. Some of these terms, beautiful and sacred as they are, have been sectarianized, such as Disciples, Friends, Christians, Saints, Brethren and the Church, the Church of Christ and the Church of God. Says Mr. Ryan, "Manifestly, in all these cases, the name is used in a partisan sense—as separative and

not comprehensive; as distinguishing these groups from others, not identifying them with others. And just as manifestly, this use of the name is false, and these efforts to claim them in an exclusive sense an absurdity.'' The difficulty, however, is that the various religious bodies, taking these Scriptural names, have their own conventions, their own colleges, their own missionary boards and their own church papers. These are the things that maintain parties and partisans. Interdenominational work breaks down party fences. In restoring the lost unity of the Church there must come the true use and significance of the New Testament names, but their restoration will come out of characters that shall be so much alike and like Him that there will be no other names by which they could appropriately be called other than those associated with the earthly life of Jesus. This book is a valuable contribution to Christian unity.

WHAT THE WORLD OWES LUTHER. By JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER, D.D., LL.D., New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 94 pages. 50 cents net.

ONE of the fire-pillars in the dark and mysterious pilgrimage of mankind is Martin Luther, of whom the Roman Catholic historian Döllinger said, ''I see in Luther a great and noble character against whose person I would not cast a stone.'' There is no small book dealing with Luther that is quite so satisfactory as this fascinating little volume from the gifted pen of Dr. Remensnyder. In the fourteen chapters he touches on every phase of Luther's life from his early years to his growing fame, which grows brighter with the lapse of years. It is brilliant in style, scholarly in treatment and satisfactory in presentation.

THE ORIGIN AND GROWTH OF THE HEBREW RELIGION. By HENRY THATCHER FOWLER, Professor of Biblical Literature and History in Brown University. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 190 pages. $1.00 net.

THIS volume is not a series of essays on the history of the Hebrew religion, but it is a study of that religion, directing the student to the sources for the discovery of the facts. The twelve chapters cover the deliverance and the covenant, the wars of Yahweh, religion and national life, the God of justice and love, the exalted God of nations, religion and law, the discovery of the individual, two ideals from the exile, legalism triumphant, the two hopes, and Israel's contribution to universal religion. It is written in a clear, fascinating style, taking the reader through centuries of the religious life of one of the most interesting nations in history, finding its climax in the holy fields of the New Testament, when Jesus said to the woman at the well, ''Neither in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, shall ye worship the Father. God is a spirit; and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth;'' from which Mr. Fowler draws his concluding sentence: ''Now, at last, the unseen God was made visible

to man in the person of His Son, and the hour was come when the faith which had been developed and sheltered at Jerusalem should be spread throughout all the world.''

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION OF AN AMERICAN CITIZEN. By Francis Greenwood Peabody, Plummer Professor of Christian Morals (Emeritus) in Harvard University. New York: The Macmillan Company. 214 pages. $1.25 net.

This is a timely book. American citizenship is considered far too lightly. This book calls attention to some of the influences which contribute to the religious education of the American citizen as well as some of the obstacles in the way of religious progress. What are the defects and what are the virtues of the American character of which religious teaching should take account? are some of the questions to which answers are eagerly and feverishly sought by many thoughtful minds. While Dr. Peabody claims only exploratory excursions into these answers, this little volume is both satisfactory and illuminating in dealing with these vital problems by one so competent to speak.

PROGRESS. Anniversary Volume of the Campbell Institute on the Completion of Twenty Years of History. Edited by Herbert L. Willett, Orvis F. Jordan and Charles M. Sharpe. Chicago: The Christian Century Press. 329 pages. $1.50 net.

The Campbell Institute is an organization of university-trained men, who belong to the Disciples of Christ. They seek to keep alive a scholarly spirit by promoting a quiet self-culture and a higher spirituality among themselves and the churches and by encouraging each other to do productive work with a view to the enrichment of the literature and thought of the Disciples. This book, with its nineteen contributors, discusses frankly such progress as has been evident in the last twenty years in doctrine, unity, affiliations, social problems, catholicism, Protestantism, missions, preaching, science, philosophy, fine arts, etc. It is an informing and interesting volume, setting forth the purpose of the Campbell Institute as helpers and watchers of progress. It is enriched with many-sided thoughts.

RECORDS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS. BOOK I: THE RECORD OF MT-MK-LK. BOOK II. THE RECORD OF JOHN. By Henry Burton Sharman, Ph.D. New York. George H. Doran Company. 319 pages. $2.50 net.

The New Testament student will hail this book with the most cordial welcome. It harmonizes the synoptic Gospels in a new setting. While the Gospel of John is given by itself with the fullest possible cross reference to the synoptics, it classifies the records in the life of Jesus in twenty-four chapters. Some of these are, Development of Opposition

to Jesus, Contemporary Opinions About the Worth of Jesus, Tour of the Disciples and Resultant Events, Discourse on Events of the Future, etc. Dr. Sharman describes the book as "a super-harmony of the Gospels." There is no attempt in this scholarly work to dislocate any passage, but by printing consecutive passages in Roman type it permits a continuous reading of each Gospel, while passages that are similar are given in foot-notes, making the whole work so thorough and satisfying that it will not only save time to the busy student, but will furnish suggestions to a larger and more consecutive study in the life of Jesus. While its aim in setting forth the material is for an historical rather than a critical knowledge of the records, the literary phenomena of the records have been exhibited as to provide the basis for somewhat thorough critical study of the source of relationships of these records. It is a book that the student will revel in to great profit.

THE NEW LAYMAN FOR THE NEW TIME. By WILLIAM ALLEN HARPER, LL.D., President of Elon College. Author of "Preparing the Teacher," etc. New York: Fleming H. Revell Company. 1917. 160 pages. 75 cents, net.

THE place of the layman in the modern Church is so different from that in the primitive Church that in President Harper's discussion of it he presents with delightful lucidity the interpretation of the layman's place and at the same time challenges the layman to greater service. The book is divided into five chapters dealing with the layman as a help to the minister, the Church, in evangelism and social service, the first chapter being a presentation of the layman's place in history. In his appeal for the priesthood of believers in a spiritual devotion, he sets forth a preacher as God's prophet being a real leader in all of life's many-sidedness, and at the same time discusses the qualities that should be exhibited by the layman and the possibilities of his producing in the minister a nobler type of service to God. Such a book could be put with profit in the hands of those laymen who are seeking the way into larger service, and in every church there are always a few of these. It points the way to that opportunity and will help both the minister and the layman.

CB

L. VII NO. 4

"The greatest need of our generation is that of apostles of reconciliation."—JOHN R. MOTT.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Edited by PETER AINSLIE

THE great sin of the five hundred different religious Communions is that each believes that it is a law unto itself, thereby shattering the spiritual universe into as many parts as there are Communions and each building up itself at the expense of pulling down what Jesus came to establish. The time has come for new discoveries. The United Church is already overdue.

APRIL, 1918

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY
Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

AGENTS:
Christian Board of Publication, *St. Louis*
Maruzen Company, Ltd., *Tokyo, Osaka, Kyoto, Fukuoka* and *Sendai*
Oliphants, Ltd., 21 Paternoster Square, *London, E. C. 4;* 100, Princes Street, *Edinburgh*

TWO DOLLARS A YEAR FIFTY CENTS A COPY

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

A Journal in the Interest of Peace in the Divided Church of Christ. It is issued in January, April, July and October.

Edited by PETER AINSLIE

Vol. VII. APRIL, 1918 No. 4

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:

PENTECOST AND UNITY 9

AN AUSTRALIAN'S VIEW OF CHURCH UNION. GEORGE HALL .. 11

THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER. ROBERT H. GARDINER 22

THE CATHOLIC AND PURITAN SPIRIT ESSENTIAL TO UNITY. ALBERT JAMES COLLISON 33

PRESENT DUTY OF DISCIPLES IN REGARD TO CHRISTIAN UNITY. GEORGE WILLIAM BROWN 47

THE PROBLEM OF PROTESTANT UNITY. JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER 64

NOTES AND COMMENTS 73

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 78

THIS JOURNAL IS PUBLISHED BY THE ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY and is the servant of the whole Church, irrespective of name or creed. It offers its pages as a forum to the entire Church of Christ for a frank and courteous discussion of those problems that have to do with the healing of our unchristian divisions. Its readers are in all Communions.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 a year—fifty cents a copy. Remittance should be made by New York draft, express order or money order.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS should be addressed to THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

Entered as second-class matter in the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo.

Organizations for the Promotion of Christian Unity

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Inc. Having its inception in the work of Thomas Campbell, 1809, present organization 1910, President, Rev. Peter Ainslie, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A. For intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith." Pentecost Sunday is the day named for special prayers for and sermons on Christian unity in all Churches.

ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF THE UNITY OF CHRISTENDOM, 1857, President, Athelstan Riley, Esq., 2 Kensington Court, London; Secretary in the United States, Rev. Calbraith Bourn Perry, Cambridge, N. Y. For intercessory prayer for the reunion of the Roman Catholic, Greek and Anglican Communions.

CHRISTIAN UNITY ASSOCIATION OF SCOTLAND, 1903, Secretary, Rev. Robert W. Weir, Edinburgh. For maintaining, fostering and expressing the consciousness of the underlying unity that is shared by many members of the different Churches in Scotland.

CHRISTIAN UNITY FOUNDATION, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Frederick Courtney, office, 143 E. 37th St., New York. For the promotion of Christian unity throughout the world by research and conference.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION, 1896, President, Sir Richard Stapley; Hon. Secretary, Rev. C. Moxon, Marske Rectory, Richmond, Yorkshire, England. For cultivation of friendly relations between the Church of England and all other Christian bodies.

COMMISSION ON THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER, 1910, President, Rt. Rev. Charles P. Anderson, Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Esq., Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. For a world conference of all Christians relative to the unity of Christendom.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA, 1908, President, Rev. Frank Mason North, Secretary, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, 105 E. 22d St., New York. For the coöperation of the various Protestant Communions in service rather than an attempt to unite upon definitions of theology and polity.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND, 1895, President, Rev. Principal W. B. Selbie, Mansfield College, Oxford, Secretary, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Memorial Hall, E. C., London. For facilitating fraternal intercourse and coöperation among the Evangelical Free Churches in England.

SWANWICK FREE CHURCH FELLOWSHIP, 1911, Rev. Malcolm Spencer, 17 Palace Road, Crouch End, London, N. For the cultivation of corporate prayer and thought for a new spiritual fellowship and communion with all branches of the Christian Church.

Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity

Inc.

(Having its Inception in the Work of Thomas Campbell a Presbyterian Minister of Washington, Pa., 1809)

An Organization of Disciples of Christ

PURPOSE OF THE ASSOCIATION: To watch for every indication of Christian unity and to hasten the time, by intercessory prayer, friendly conferences and distribution of irenic literature, "till we all attain unto the unity of the faith."

> Ινα πάντες ἓν ὦσιν, καθὼς σύ, πάτήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ κἀγὼ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἓν ὦσιν, ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύη ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας.
>
> Ut omnes unum sint, sicut tu Pater in me, et ego in te, ut et ipsi in nobis unum sint, ut credat mundus, quia tu me misisti.
>
> *That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me.*

CONDITION OF MEMBERSHIP IN THE ASSOCIATION: Sympathy with the work of Christian unity, expressed in prayer and coöperation, irrespective of Church affiliation, and the payment of not less than $2.50 for annual membership fee, payment preferably in January. Those paying less are counted contributors, but not members.

COMMISSIONERS: Peter Ainslie, D.D., LL.D., President, Baltimore, Md.; Carey E. Morgan, M.A., Vice-President, Nashville, Tenn.; F. D. Kershner, M.A., LL.D., Secretary, Cincinnati, Ohio; H. C. Armstrong, M.A., B.D., Baltimore, Md.; E. B. Bagby, M.A., B.D., Washington, D. C.; F. W. Burnham, LL.D., Cincinnati, Ohio; I. S. Chenoweth, M.A., Philadelphia, Pa.; Finis S. Idleman, D.D., New York, N. Y.; Z. T. Sweeney, LL.D., Columbus, Ind.; B. A. Abbott, B.A., St. Louis, Mo.; E. M. Bowman, Esq., New York, N. Y.; C. M. Chilton, D.D., St. Joseph, Mo.; J. H. Garrison, M.A., LL.D., Claremont, Cal.; J. H. Goldner, B.A., Cleveland, Ohio; F. A. Henry M.A., LL.B., Cleveland, Ohio; T. C. Howe, Ph.D., Indianapolis, Ind.; W. P. Lipscomb, Esq., Washington, D. C.; R. A. Long, Esq., Kansas City, Mo.; C. S. Medbury, D.D., Des Moines, Ia.; C. C. Morrison B.A., Chicago, Ill.; W. C. Pearce, Esq., Chicago, Ill.; A. B. Philputt, D.D., LL.D., Indianapolis, Ind.; E. L. Powell, LL.D., Louisville, Ky.; W. F. Richardson, M.A., LL.D., Los Angeles, Cal.; I. J. Spencer, M.A., LL.D., Lexington, Ky.

WORK OF THE ASSOCIATION: The Commission of the Association is simply the Executive Committee of twenty-five members, nine of whom are the Committee on Direction, dealing with such problems as may come before the Association for action between the annual meetings. It is proposed to use this Commission under four divisions: namely, Commission on Christian Unity, dealing with Christian unity in general; Commission on a World Conference on Faith and Order; Commission on Federation; and Commission on International Friendship. To all these subjects the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity has spoken. The Association publishes *The Christian Union Quarterly.*

For further particulars, address

Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity

PETER AINSLIE, President

Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.

Bibliography of Christian Unity

THE BOOKS included in this list are by Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Roman Catholics, Congregationalists, Unitarians, Lutherans, Baptists, Disciples of Christ, etc.

CHRISTIAN UNION, Van Dyke, Appleton, 1885 ..... $1.00
CHRISTIAN UNION, Garrison, St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1906 ..... 1.00
CHRISTIAN UNION IN EFFORT, Firth, Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1911.. 1.50
CHRISTIAN UNION IN SOCIAL SERVICE, Carlile, London, Clarke & Co., 1913 ..... 2/6
CHRISTIAN UNITY, Briggs, Scribner, 1900 ..... 1.00
CHRISTIAN UNITY AT WORK, Macfarland, Federal Council 1.00
CHURCH DIVISIONS AND CHRISTIANITY, Grane, Macmillan, 1916.... 2.00
HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS ADVOCATING CHRISTIAN UNION, Young, Chicago, The Christian Century Co., 1904 ..... 1.00
HOW TO PROMOTE CHRISTIAN UNION, Kershner, Cincinnati, The Standard Publishing Co., 1916 ..... 1.00
LECTURES ON THE REUNION OF THE CHURCH, Döllinger, Dodd, 1872 1.50
LIBRARY OF CHRISTIAN COÖPERATION (Federal Council) Macfarland. 5 Vols. 5.00
OUR PLEA FOR UNION AND THE PRESENT CRISIS, Willett, Chicago, Christian Century Co. ..... .50
PASSING PROTESTANTISM AND COMING CATHOLICISM, Smyth, Scribner, 1908 ..... 1.00
PROGRESS OF CHURCH FEDERATION, Macfarland, Revell..... .50
RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS OF THE WORLD, London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1908 .....
RESTATEMENT AND REUNION, Streeter, Macmillan, 1914..... .75
SOME THOUGHTS OF CHRISTIAN REUNION, Carpenter, Macmillan, 1895 ..... 1.25
SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROMOTION OF UNITY IN CHRISTENDOM, Tarner, London, Elliott Stock, 1895.....
THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, Wells, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1905.... .75
THAT THEY ALL MAY BE ONE, Whyte, Armstrong, 1907 ..... .25
THE CHRISTIAN SYSTEM, Campbell, St. Louis, Christian Board of Publication, 1890 ..... 1.00
THE CHURCH AND RELIGIOUS UNITY, Kelly, Longmans, 1913..... 1.50
THE CHURCHES OF THE FEDERAL COUNCIL, Macfarland, Revell.... 1.00
THE LARGER CHURCH, Lanier, Fredericksburg, Va. 1.25
THE LEVEL PLAN FOR CHURCH UNION, Brown, Whittaker, 1910..... 1.50
THE MEANING OF CHRISTIAN UNITY, Cobb, Crowell, 1915..... 1.25
THE MESSAGE OF THE DISCIPLES FOR THE UNION OF THE CHURCH, Ainslie, Revell, 1913..... 1.00
THE PSYCHOLOGY OF RELIGIOUS SECTS, McComas, Revell, 1912.... 1.25
THE SEVENFOLD UNITY OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH, Hall, Longmans, 1911 ..... .75
THE UNION OF CHRISTIAN FORCES IN AMERICA, Ashworth, Philadelphia. American Sunday-School Union, 1915..... .75
THE UNITED CHURCH OF THE UNITED STATES, Shields, Scribner, 1895 ..... 2.50
THOUGHTS OF THE PRESENT POSITION OF PROTESTANTISM, Harnack, Macmillan, 1899 ..... 1.00
UNITY AND MISSIONS, Brown, Revell, 1915..... 1.50
WHAT MUST THE CHURCH DO TO BE SAVED? Simms, Revell, 1913.. 1.50

CHRISTIAN UNITY CALENDAR

A WORLD Conference on Faith and Order, time and place not yet named.

AT THE instance of the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Pentecost Sunday has been named primarily as the day for special sermons on Christian unity in all Churches, along with prayers to that end.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

GEORGE HALL

was elected president of the Council of Churches for South Australia in 1916. Formerly he was the secretary of the Wesleyan Conference and later its president. He was born at Scarborough, Yorkshire, and educated at the Wesleyan School Filey and Union College, Adelaide. He has given much time to Early Church history and has made valuable contributions to periodical literature.

ROBERT H. GARDINER

is the secretary of the commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church on the World Conference on Faith and Order. He was born in California, educated at Harvard University, and has practised law in Boston since 1880. He is the director of a national bank and also of the Boston and Albany railroad. He was for a time the president of the Brotherhood of St. Andrew and is now a member of the standing committee of the Episcopal Church for the Diocese of Maine.

ALBERT JAMES COLLISON

received the degree of LL.B. from the Baltimore University Law School and practised for five years at the bar in that city. Later he graduated from the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church and entered the active ministry of that Church. He has contributed to scientific and literary journals and is an expert worker in ceramic art. He is not in the active pastorate now.

GEORGE WILLIAM BROWN

is the professor of Hebrew and Old Testament History in the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky. He received the degree of Ph.D. from Johns Hopkins University and was a missionary in India from 1900 to 1917, being located most of the time in Jubbulpore as principal of the Christian Bible College.

JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER

is the pastor of St. James Lutheran Church, New York. He was president of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in 1911. He has served in pastorates in Philadelphia and Savannah, Ga. He is a trustee of the Carnegie Church Peace Union and is an active worker in the Federal Council of the Churches. Of the books he has written, *The Atonement and Modern Thought, Mysticism, What the World Owes Luther,* etc., are the best known.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PRAYER LEAGUE

(Membership in this League is open to all Christians—Greek, Roman, Anglican and Protestant, the only requirement being a notice by post card or letter of one's desire to be so enrolled, stating the Church of which he is a member. Address, Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, Seminary House, 504 N. Fulton Ave., Baltimore, Md., U. S. A.)

MEDITATION:

"There is no better way, I believe, in which to test the reality of our culture than by the self-discipline it teaches us to use in talk; and it may be that the chief service we can render, the chief outcome that God looks for from our higher education, is that in our homes, in the society around us, we should set a higher example of the right use of speech; the right tone and temper and reticence in conversation; the abhorrence of idle words. Neither let us think that this ever will be easy to us. We must not be affected or pedantic, we must not be always setting other people right; but we must be careful; we must keep our wishes and passions from colouring our view of things; we must take great pains to enter into the minds and feelings of others, to understand how things look to them, and we must remember that, whatever pains we take in that regard, the result is still sure to be imperfect; we must rule our moods, our likes and dislikes, with a firm hand; we must distrust our general impressions till we have frankly, faithfully examined them; we must resist the desire to say clever or surprising things; we must be resolute not to overstate our case; we must let nothing pass our lips that charity would check; we must be always ready to confess our ignorance, and to be silent.—Yes, it is a hard and long task; but it is for a high end, and in a noble service. It is that we may be able to help others; to possess our souls in days of confusion and vehemence and controversy; to grow in the rare grace of judgment; to be such that people may trust us, whether they agree with us or not. It is that we may somewhat detach ourselves from the stream of talk, and learn to listen for the voice of God, and to commit our ways to Him."—BISHOP PAGET in *Studies in the Christian Character.*

PRAYER:

O Gracious Lord Jesus, by Thine inconceivable Self-abasement in Thy most holy Incarnation: by Thy daily Self-abasement in Thy Life as a Man amongst fellow-men: by Thine utter Self-abasement through Thy Cross and Passion: by Thy crowning Self-abasement in Crucifixion between two malefactors: grant us humility. Lest we put Thee to an open shame: lest we fall from Thee: lest we never see Thee as Thou art, Thou Who art the Same yesterday, and today, and for ever: grant us humility. Amen.—CHRISTINA G. ROSETTI.

PRACTICAL USE OF PRESENT DAY UNITY

We lay this down as an axiomatic truth: It is as much our duty to manifest and put to some practical use the unity which already exists, as it is to labor and pray for an ideal unity that is yet far in the future. Indeed the way to hasten the ideal unity is to put to practical use the unity which we already have. "To him that hath shall be given, and to him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath," is a universal law in the kingdom of grace. . . . We are coming more and more to understand that if we have the common faith that unites us to Christ, that makes us obedient to Him, we may hold differences of opinion, and work and worship in different ways, without interfering with our oneness in Christ or our fellowship with each other. How far denominational lines will be obliterated, and present forms of organization modified, in order to the realization of New Testament unity, is a question which would be answered differently by persons occupying different points of view; but one thing, we think, may be said with assurance, and that is that, in so far as our existing denominationalism interferes with the freest and fullest fellowship between Christians, and with their hearty coöperation in advancing the kingdom of God by the diversion of resources for purely sectarian purposes, or by confusing the minds of those without by our differing names and creeds, it must give way to that unity of faith and purpose, of spirit and life that subordinates everything else to the triumph of the kingdom of God on earth.

—J. H. Garrison, in *Christian Union.*

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY

Vol. VII. APRIL, 1918 No. 4

EDITORIAL

PENTECOST AND UNITY

Let us make Pentecost Sunday such a day for preaching on Christian unity and prayers to that end as will open in our thinking the possibilities of real brotherhood among believers. Last year many Churches observed the day; this year more will observe it. Much preaching on unity and praying for unity must be done before we can begin to think in terms of unity. The weakness of a divided Church is slowly, but permanently, being recognized. When we really think about the folly of our divided condition we find a mild expression of its counterpart in the Bolsheviki movements in Russia, only sin is making greater disaster in our ranks in consequence of our division than the German army is making in Russia.

But the mind must be free in its operations. There must be heroic ventures of faith, irrespective of denominational customs. The soul must recognize that its fellowship is with God and all mankind before it can proceed upon its mission of healing the divided Church. Denominational clamor must be hushed or one must move so far away from it that he cannot hear its echo in his own heart. Labels are cheap distinctions. The

man himself must be something before he can teach something. Being baptized seven times in the Jordan, supplemented by all the ritualism of ancient and modern times, will not do that. Love must be expressed among Christians else an interrogation mark may be put after the sign on the Church buildings and beneath the cross on the steeple. If such love be a good deal to ask of any one and its realization lies in the far future, then it must not be forgotten that it is no more than Christ asked and the distance for its consummation depends upon us who believe in Jesus. It is the sign that Jesus left us. It has long been lost amid the rubbish of sectarianism. Its discovery is the greatest quest of the hour. Find it and at once it would become the sesame to every problem that has to do with social relations and spiritual aspirations.

Let no man glory in his denomination; that is sectarianism: but let all men glory in Christ and practise the common brotherhood of mankind; that is Christianity.

Somewhat beneath the five hundred different kinds of faith as expressed by Roman Catholics and Protestants there is the one faith. Who can find it? One denominationalist says, "It is here with us," another says, "It is here with us," and they have quarreled so bitterly over it that, as John Morley said in his opening chapter in his volume on Voltaire, it has resulted in "more blood being shed for the cause of Christianity than for any other cause whatsoever!" The question is still pertinent: Who can find the faith that will lead men to be brothers? By their fruits men shall know whether they are on the way.

The question is not: What must we give up? Instead it is: What have we to give for the spiritual enrichment of the Church of God? Survey the field; find the gift that none other has to give; and make your deposit into the treasury of His abundant grace.

AN AUSTRALIAN'S VIEW OF CHURCH UNION

By GEORGE HALL, ex-President Methodist Conference and President Council of Churches of S. A., Riverton, South Australia.

THERE is on the part of many of the best Christian people of the Australian Commonwealth, an increasingly strong desire for a closer union of all the followers of our Lord Jesus Christ. We can have no doubt as to the source of that desire. It is inspired by the Holy Spirit of God. The absence of such a union, and the spirit that so effectually prevents it, is standing in the way of that perfect fellowship with God and the saints, which is the privilege, and should be the experience, of all who belong to the household of faith. Our disunion also prevents the full flow of that Pentecostal grace which the church needs for the conversion of the world.

Invisible unity not sufficient. Many Christians have been taught to pray for a spiritual unity, but to regard organic union as undesirable, if not, indeed, impossible. We do not believe that in an invisible spiritual unity of such as differ in faith and order, we have all for which our Lord prayed when He said: "That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." A true spiritual unity will, no doubt, facilitate a visible union. It will, indeed, be essential to the realization of that Divine ideal. But a unity that does not visualize itself in a union, leaves much to be desired and to be prayed for. It is the duty of all Christian people to unite with God and each other in making manifest to the world the existence of such a spiritual oneness, and thereby vastly increasing its value. "There *is* unity but the world cannot see it. There *is* unity but the world does not believe it. Our part is to

coöperate with God and yield to the strivings of the Holy Ghost, so that the unity of the Church will be actualized and visualized in such corporate manner that the world can see it with its own eyes, and, seeing, will believe in the power and love of God." We may for a time fail in the attempt, but to fail to make the attempt is to prove our weakness and to reveal our guilt.

In the year 1907 there appeared in the columns of *The Times* (London) a very important letter, below which were the signatures of many leaders of Christian thought in England, including such well-known names as the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, J. H. Jowett, C. H. Kelly, F. B. Meyer and Robert Rainey. Amongst many other important and impressive statements the signatories said, "We agree in believing profoundly that our Lord Jesus Christ meant us to be one in visible fellowship; we feel profoundly the paralyzing effect upon the moral forces of Christianity which our divisions inevitably produce; and we recognize with the fullest conviction that it is the duty of all Christians, who desire in this respect the fulfilment of the divine purpose, to give themselves to penitence and prayer—to penitence because we have all, in various ways, as bodies and as individuals, contributed to produce and to perpetuate differences; and to prayer because what we all alike need is that God should open our minds and hearts to receive without prejudice the gradual revelation of His will as to the ways by which we are to be drawn together." That statement deeply impressed us and it no doubt expresses the conviction of many millions of Christian people.

Our present duty. The time has come for further action. Whatever justification there may have been for some of our unhappy divisions, the present duty is that of *rapprochement.* It has been said that poly-churchism is as foreign to the New Testament as is polytheism. Unfortunately that age of golden days did not long con-

tinue. If the whole spirit of the New Testament is opposed to division, its writers had seen to deplore the existence of an unfortunate schism. We may ask, Have all the separation of Christian people from an ancient Church, and the formation of new Churches, been schismatical and unjustifiable acts? If so, where was the schism? Was it with the Church, that, having gradually departed from its original faith and practice, resented any attempt on the part of its more spiritual members, to return to apostolic simplicity and purity; denied them the Christian sacraments, and so virtually lost out the reforming element? Or was the act of schism the sin of those who for their love of truth were thrown out and had a distinctive name forced upon them? We can have very little difficulty in finding the true answer. But, whatever the fault and by whomsoever it was committed, we must strive to come together again and at the earliest possible moment, in an honorable and helpful union. If we imagine that we have an easy task, then it is very evident that we have not given much serious thought to the question. The task of realizing an universal visible union of our Lord's Body—the Church—is probably the most difficult duty to which man has ever been called. Its realization through God, by faith and prayer, will be one of the greatest triumphs in the history of our race.

Difficulties not insuperable. However great and numerous the difficulties may be, they are not insurmountable. It is clearly the plan and will of God, and therefore by divine grace and wisdom, and with prayers and efforts of the faithful it shall be accomplished. That it may not come in this, or even in the next generation, will not justify us in any spirit of indifference, or in the delay for one day of the exercise of any influence with which the Lord has entrusted us. It is reported of Grotius that he once said, "I shall never cease to do my utmost for establishing peace amongst Christians . . .

If there were no hopes of success at present, ought we not to sow the seed which may be useful for posterity?" How can we, who love our Lord, and who pray daily, "Thy Kingdom come," view with indifference that which stands in the way of the divine will, and which so manifestly and sadly retards the advance of His Kingdom?

Questions of faith. We cannot suppose that that unity for which our Lord prayed must await an absolute and universal agreement as to what is the true interpretation of all New Testament teachings. If we wait until we can build up a great body and doctrine on which all the Churches of Christendom shall be agreed, then we shall probably wait until the crack of doom. Such unanimity of judgment or conviction is in the nature of things impossible. As to what may be regarded as the great essential doctrines of Christianity, we are already much more in agreement than is generally supposed. The differences are not so much in our beliefs as in our statement of them. The agreement must not, however, be gained by a process of elimination until we have reached an irreducible minimum. There must be no yielding of strong and intelligent conviction for the sake of compromise; no emasculation of essential doctrine in deference to the wish of a majority. It must be an agreement by comprehension rather than by compromise. The things that are most surely held by most Protestant Churches could probably be accepted by them all.

The Bishop of Chicago has well said, "Unity will never be reached by slenderness, but by fulness. Instead of approaching the great problem upon the basis of excluding everything from the future united Church, which does not seem to attain to the inner essence of Christianity, we must come together with the idea of mutually contributing to the common faith and to the common life. Let all the separated parts of Christendom pour out the treasures of their several inheritances, and of their acquired experience; and let them equally desire to receive

from one another the gifts which they do not already possess. Let Catholicism add to Protestantism its spirit of worship, its sacramental life, its unwavering faith, and its rich heritage of continuity with the historic past. And let Protestantism on the other hand add to Catholicism its fearlessness of learning, its stern conception of individual responsibility and its emphasis upon personal religion. So shall we have in the great Church of the future not an impoverished and shadowy form of Christianity, fenced about with barriers of exclusion, but a Church which is enriched by all the wealth of the Christian ages."

A conference of representative churchmen, after much united prayer and under the guidance of the divine Spirit, willing to look at all questions from the viewpoint of others, will find that many things to which they clung tenaciously, thinking them of the very greatest importance, were really of much less value than were some of the things which they had excluded.

Matters of order. In our modes of Church government we must be prepared to grant diversity. So long as the methods are not out of harmony with the ascertained principles and practices and the New Testament and meet the spirit and needs of the times, why not grant liberty? The New Testament enforces no particular form of Church polity. It leaves room—as a world religion must—for the characteristic judgments of each age and nation and for the guidance of the ever-present Spirit of God, to meet the new conditions that arise.

Forms of worship. We must provide for the recognition of the Trinity of the Godhead, the sacrifice and High Priesthood of Jesus Christ, the regenerating and guiding influence of the Holy Ghost, the public reading of the Holy Scriptures, the faithful preaching of the great fact of our Lord's life and death and resurrection, and the due administration of the divinely appointed sacraments. Having provided for that, we may well leave a large

place in the order of our worship to be determined by racial or national predilections, and by temperamental, educational and other preferences, and even by individual idiosyncrasies.

Disunion and unbelief. Our present disunion is productive of much unbelief. Our real unity is not easily appreciated, whilst our disunion is apparent to all. Men are not influenced so much by logic as by feeling. Though unable to fully justify our divisions, we can explain them, and under unseemly difference we can trace a true unity; but the average man does not look below the surface of things. There are many who, counting up the numerous divisions into which the Christian Church has been split, exclaim, "Amongst so many Churches, where is *the* Church?" Others, interpreting the differences of opinion, or the convictions arising from so many different viewpoints as evidences of self-will or hatred, sneeringly say, "See how those Christians love one another!" We have too often accentuated our doctrinal differences, and have regarded some arbitrary interpretation of an isolated text as if it were a fundamemntal truth. When the unsympathetic onlooker finds us disputing, and sometimes disputing with much warmth of feelings, concerning some matter of no great moment, he too readily concludes that he may safely improve us all. Much of the sad indifference and unbelief of the age may be traced to the fact of a divivded and contentious Church.

As related to foreign missions. The folly and weakness of disunion is especially evident on the foreign mission field. There are, of course, many beautiful examples of harmonious working side by side of different branches of the one Church, but often the condition of things is pitiable in the extreme. Why should we display our doctrinal and ecclesiastical differences in the presence of heathen spectators? Why confuse with the smoke of our unprofitable sectarian battles those who are

recent converts from idolatry? One of the most pitiable sights which human eyes can witness is that of a Christian missionary endeavoring to convince the men and women won from heathenism that his Church is right and the other missionary's Church is wrong. Whatever we may do at home—where it is well understood that our hearts are much better than our disputings would indicate—let us be at one in the presence of the non-Christian world, and especially in the presence of a Christ-hating Mohammedanism. Until the happy day of a united Christendom in the foreign mission field arrives, let us, as far as possible, keep off each other's area of operations.

The thing that we are deprecating is keenly felt in India and Africa and many other fields today. The evil effects of it were found to be so acute in British East Africa that a definite, and we hope a not altogether fruitless, attempt at a remedy was made by the members of what is known as the Kikuyu Conference. It is related that Nelson reconciled Collingwood to a captain with whom he had quarreled by saying, as he pointed to the French ships, "Look! There is the enemy." Too often, as Charles Kingsley said, "We are wasting our time in disputing concerning the accidentals of the Bread of Life, forgetful that thousands are perishing for want of any Bread of Life at all."

The missionaries of the Cross have come back from the advanced line of the great Christian crusade, and have told us that the one supreme obstacle to the conversion of the world is the disunity of the Christian forces. This is flung as a challenge into their face. "When Christians are themselves agreed as to what Christianity is, then we will hear you." The fundamental problem of Christian missions is the problem of Christian union. We have, happily, through the counsel of Sir William McGregor and the help of our Commonwealth authorities, agreed as to a division of

territory that will prevent the overlapping of Church agencies in New Guinea and amongst the aborigines of Northern Australia.

Why this waste? An unchristian disunion means a serious waste of money and energy. The withdrawal of agents from districts in the homelands, where there is now a serious overlapping of agencies, would enable us to meet some of the insistent and pathetic appeals which reach us from the regions beyond. We are aware that this is not the most important or inspiring reason for Christian union, but it is one that cannot be left out of view in any discussion of the question. While Christian people generally give such a small part of their wealth for the propagation of the Gospel, it is surely the duty of the Church to use its resources so as to obtain the best possible spirit, not results. It is not creditable to us that whilst millions of our fellowmen live and die without any knowledge of the facts of our Lord's life and death, we have in one small town half a dozen sections of the Church of the one Lord and Saviour, and that our doctrinal and other differences are so slender that they can hardly be discovered or explained. In many instances the work of God could be done with equal, if not with greater efficiency, by one-half the number. We are convinced that the day is not far distant when the intelligence and good sense of Christian people will determine that there shall be an end to such waste. It is sometimes contended that without organic union, but by means of conferences amongst the Churches of any given district, we could prevent such overlapping. That might be a useful temporary expedient, but it cannot be accepted as a sufficient and permanent plan.

The hopeful outlook. We are so deeply impressed with the intellectual, spiritual and practical qualities of the movement begun in 1910 by the Protestant Episcopal Church in the U. S. A. that we feel impelled to use any influence we possess in commending it to the Christian people of Australia. Commissions have been appointed

in most of the Protestant denominations of the Commonwealth, and some of these communions have held united meetings to consider the attitude of the Australian Churches to the movement. It is difficult to gauge the feeling or conviction on the question. It may be stated that the Methodist Church, at its General Conference of May, 1917, appointed a committee with representatives from all the states of the Federation, and gave to that committee the power to appoint a representative to the World Conference on Faith and Order. Other Churches may also send representatives. It is expected that when the war ends and the promoters of the World Conference see their mighty faith and splendid Christian audacity honored, that of Australia will be there.

It is true that there are many amongst us who describe the attempt as Utopian, as wildly and vainly conceived; harmless it may be, but totally impracticable. There are others who regard all attempts at union as unnecessary. They do not expect or desire anything beyond a deeper spiritual and invisible unity, together with a measure of coöperation in the mission field and an understanding that shall prevent an excessive number of Churches at home! There are many of us—and the number is increasing—who rejoice in any earnest, intelligent and sincere attempt toward corporate union. We shall continue to pray for its realization, believing that only thus can our Lord's desire for the oneness of His people be fully realized.

Sectional union in Australia. The Presbyterian Churches are practically all one, united in a General Assembly, which meets biennially in the chief centers of the Commonwealth. A very small number of "Free" Churches refused to join in a happy union which took place many years ago. This section of the Presbyterian Church makes little or no advance. The united Church enjoys a very vigorous life. The Congregationalists are all united, and last year held their sixth Triennial As-

sembly in the City of Brisbane. The Baptist Church is also federated all over Australia, as are also the Churches of Christ. Amongst all these Churches there is a frequent exchange of pulpits and a good deal of friendly coöperation through the "Council of Churches," in temperance and social reform movements, and in evangelistic and other efforts. The Anglican Church, though often found in union with other Churches on social and moral reform questions, generally follows the example of the same Church in England, and an interchange of pulpits is rare and without the sanction of the central authorities.

Up to the year 1900 the Methodists were divided into at least six branches, but in that year, and after many years of negotiation, they became one. It is pleasing to report that this union of Churches on a large scale in Australia is a decided success. Nearly the whole of the ministers and adherents came into the union and have lived and worked together with the greatest harmony.

Attempts at further unions. As far back as 1900 attempts were made to secure a union of the Evangelical Churches on the basis of the central verities of the Christian faith. In 1903 the Presbyterians, Congregationalists and Methodists met in Conference to consider a basis of doctrine and polity. In the hope that the Anglican and Baptist Churches might also unite, negotiations for the smaller union were delayed for a time.

The Anglican Church, finding that its relation to the English Establishment deprived it of any power of autonomy, withdrew and for a time the other Churches seemed to cool off. Then in 1916 the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia declared that, in view of the fact that the great war had added fresh urgency to the union project, and that the Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregational Churches of Canada had resolved to unite, and that the Canadian basis of union was accessible, the committee on union be reappointed.

The appointment of a committee, together with other important resolutions, was carried with practical unanimity.

In the same year the Congregational Union, in its Triennial Assembly, appointed a committee with authority to consider a basis of union with the Presbyterian, Baptist and Methodist Churches. In 1917 the Methodist Church of Australia at its Triennial Conference appointed a committee with representatives from all the states to enter into negotiations with the other Churches, and that in the event of a basis of union being provisionally agreed upon the question should be sent to all the annual conferences and district and quarterly meetings. The question of a basis is therefore being considered by the three Churches in all the Australian states. No final action can be taken except by the Federal Assemblies, which meet in different years, viz., the Presbyterian in 1918, the Congregational in 1919 and the Methodist in 1920.

We have been asked to say how much of earnest purpose and conviction there is behind the resolutions of the three negotiating Churches. It is not possible for anyone to say. The speeches of the most influential advocates in the Presbyterian Church seemed to be charged with conviction, and the voting showed one hundred in favor of the movement and only nine against it. The action of the Congregationalists had all the appearance of sincerity and urgency. The same could be said of the resolutions of the chief court of Methodism, and to this may be added the fact that some of the state conferences have year after year consistently repeated their conviction that "the union of the Churches would be in accordance with the will of God and for the advancement of His Kingdom." A union of the three Churches mentioned would not fully satisfy us. We shall aim at the inclusion of every branch of the Church of Jesus Christ. For this may we ask the prayers of your readers?

GEORGE HALL.

THE WORLD CONFERENCE ON FAITH AND ORDER

By Robert H. Gardiner, Secretary Protestant Episcopal Commission on the World Conference on Faith and Order, Gardiner, Maine.

In June, 1910, was held in Edinburgh, Scotland, one of the most remarkable gatherings of Christians which had ever taken place. Missionaries from all over the world, saints and heroes, who had consecrated their lives to the effort to carry the message of the manifestation of the love of God in the Incarnation of His Son in Jesus, born of Blessed Mary, came together to consult how they might best help each other so that the force of Christianity might be directed against the hosts of sin, Satan and death.

At the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, held in Cincinnati in October, 1910, an afternoon was devoted to hearing reports of this great Missionary Conference. Of the four speakers, each tried to confine himself to his subject, but no one of them could keep away from the question of Christian unity. The Rt. Rev. Charles H. Brent, D.D., then Bishop of the Philippines, now of Western New York, described the careful preparations which had been made for two or three years before the Conference convened, and how earnestly speakers and writers had been urged not to touch on any divisive question. Then, having described the shiver of fear which ran through the great assembly whenever it seemed probable that a speaker would touch on a divisive question, he challenged the Episcopal Church to call a conference of Christians of every Communion and from every part of the world to consider those questions which they dared not face at Edinburgh. The challenge was taken up by a volunteer committee who prepared a resolution, passed unanimous-

ly the next day by the Convention, providing for the appointment of a committee to consider the matter. The next day that committee brought in the following report:

"Your committee is of one mind. We believe that the time has now arrived when representatives of the whole family of Christ, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order. We believe, further, that all Christian Communions are in accord with us in our desire to lay aside self-will, and to put on the mind which is in Christ Jesus our Lord. We would heed this call of the Spirit of God in all lowliness, and with singleness of purpose. We would place ourselves by the side of our fellow-Christians, looking not only on our own things, but also on the things of others, convinced that our one hope of mutual understanding is in taking personal counsel together in the spirit of love and forbearance. It is our conviction that such a Conference for the purpose of study and discussion, without power to legislate or to adopt resolutions, is the next step toward unity.

"With grief for our aloofness in the past, and for other faults of pride and self-sufficiency, which make for schism; with loyalty to the truth as we see it, and with respect for the convictions of those who differ from us; holding the belief that the beginnings of unity are to be found in the clear statement and full consideration of those things in which we differ, as well as of those things in which we are at one, we respectfully submit the following resolution:

"Whereas, There is to-day among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer that all His disciples may be one; that the world may believe that God has sent Him:

"Resolved, That a joint commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communions throughout the world which confess our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. The Commission shall consist of seven Bishops, appointed by the Chairman of the House of Bishops, and

seven Presbyters and seven Laymen, appointed by the President of the House of Deputies, and shall have power to add to its number and to fill any vacancies occurring before the next General Convention.''

This resolution was adopted unanimously on October 19, 1910, and a joint commission was appointed to issue invitations to the other Communions in the world to unite in arranging for and conducting such a Conference.

At the same time the National Council of Congregational Churches in America in session in Boston was passing a resolution looking toward the possibility of reunion with the Episcopal Church and the Disciples of Christ in session at Topeka, Kan., were appointing a large and vigorous Commission on Christian Union, and about the same time the Church of England in Australia was passing a resolution looking toward conference with their brethren as to reunion in Australia. Who can doubt that God the Holy Spirit was seeking to turn the hearts of Christians to living faith in the one Lord of life and love?

The Commission of the Episcopal Church organized as soon as possible and set about making the Conference known throughout the world. That has been done, and it is believed that there is hardly a post-office of any consequence in the world to which literature about the World Conference has not gone, and replies have been received from every place of importance on the globe. More than a million pamphlets have been sent out and, while no exact account of letters received has been kept, it is estimated, probably with considerable accuracy, that since October, 1910, at least seventy-five thousand letters and postal cards, in eight or ten languages, have been received. Of these there have hardly been a couple of dozen which were distinctly hostile. Of course, very many writers pointed out that the Communion to which they belonged was the true Church, and that the only

road to unity was through union with that, but they did it in a kindly spirit and expressed deep interest in the movement.

Sixty-one commissions have been appointed, representing all the leading Communions of the world, outside of the continent of Europe and the Near East. It took much patience and time to bring this about. The Episcopal Commission began at home with its Protestant brethren in the United States, but at first, not unnaturally, those brethren did not notice the ample apology made by the Episcopal Church in the report above quoted "for its aloofness in the past" and, not noticing that, they feared that it was some sort of a scheme by the Episcopal Church for the absorption of its brethren. After the support of the Protestant Communions in the United States had been obtained, a deputation was sent to the Church of England in Great Britain and Ireland and secured its support. Then the Episcopal Commission sent the Rev. Peter Ainslie, D.D., of the Disciples, the Rev. William H. Roberts, D.D., of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., and the Rev. Newman Smyth, D.D., of the Congregational Church, to Great Britain to explain the matter to the Free Churches there. The Episcopal Commission had also invited the Rev. Bishop John W. Hamilton, LL.D., of the Methodist Church, North, and the Rev. J. H. Jowett, D.D., who had been a minister of the Congregational Church in England, then pastor of the Fifth Avenue Presbyterian Church in New York, to accompany the deputation, but they were unable to get away. The deputation having secured the cordial approval of the Free Churches of Great Britain and Ireland, and having had inspiring interviews with the members of the Church of England, it then became easy to secure the support of the Church of England and the various Protestant Churches throughout other English-speaking countries.

The Episcopal Commission had expected to send a

deputation in August, 1914, to explain the idea of the Conference to the Churches of Europe and the East. Their itinerary had been arranged. Very many cordial letters promising coöperation had been received. The war broke out just before they were to sail and of course postponement was necessary, but the correspondence has been continued with eminently encouraging results.

Several important magazines of the Russian Church and a number of eminent members of that Church have urged coöperation, as has also been done by individuals in all the other European countries and in a number of ecclesiastical magazines; for instance, each of the five official papers of the Reformed Church in Hungary had published before the war articles on the subject, and in each of those districts a committee had been appointed to receive the deputation.

Eminent Roman Catholics in every continent have expressed their interest and sympathy and, above all, have promised their fervent prayers. Two or three Roman Catholic missionaries in China are celebrating the Holy Communion daily with special intention for the reunion of Christendom. A number of important Roman Catholic magazines in Italy, Spain, France and the United States have mentioned the proposal with cordiality.

A communication intended for the Roman Cardinals and Bishops was sent to Cardinal Gasparri, but he, being Secretary of State, assumed that it was intended for the Pope, and His Holiness was good enough to reply, through Cardinal Gasparri, expressing in strong terms his deep interest in the idea and promising his personal prayers.

Dr. John R. Mott, a member of the mission sent by the President to Russia in the summer of 1917 to express the sympathy of the United States with the new Russian democracy, found the World Conference movement very generally understood and thoroughly ap-

proved in Russia, and was assured of the coöperation of the Russian Church whenever conditions permit the issuance of a formal invitation.

Of course, no one can speak for the Roman Catholic Church except the Pope, but it is confidently believed that when the matter is officially presented, he will approve of the idea.

In the autumn of 1917 letters were sent to all the Bishops of the Russian and Greek Churches. Unfortunately, the upheaval in Russia occurred soon after, so that probably very few, if any, of the letters to the Russian Bishops reached their destination, but replies have been coming in from the Greek Bishops, expressing sympathy and hope for the progress of the movement.

Protestants of every Communion in every part of the world have written recognizing that a Christianity apparently divided is not true Christianity and that the world will never come to know its Saviour till all His disciples are visibly at one in Him. Christianity is the love of God manifested in His Son Incarnate, and when Christians are ready to surrender their self-will and mutual prejudices, the Saviour, lifted up before the world through their unity, will draw all men to Himself and the kingdoms of the world will become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ.

It should be distinctly understood that the World Conference is not an effort for directly constructive work toward the reunion of Christendom. It is too soon for that. The first thing to do is to remove our ignorance of each other and our prejudices. All that is now hoped for is to promote such a mutual understanding and appreciation between Christians that the way may be prepared for more direct efforts. To understand is to love, just as to love is to understand, and without the perfect love which is complete understanding Christians will make no permanent progress toward reunion. One of the essentials of true love is the fearless facing of dif-

ferences. It is hoped that in the World Conference Christians will look their differences squarely in the face and in a spirit of the deepest love and humility examine those differences to the root. It is confidently expected that such an examination will show that the differences are by no means as numerous or as insuperable as we have supposed in our ignorance of each other, and very often it will be found that the superficial consideration, which is all that too many of us give to the great facts and doctrines of Christianity, has obscured from our view vital parts of the faith. We must learn that the Christian faith is not a mere matter of the intellect only, but of the whole of a man—his mind, his heart, and, above all, his will—by which he grasps and makes his own the fact of God Incarnate in the one Person of His Son in Jesus Christ, born of Blessed Mary.

William Law's definition of faith is this:

> Now, faith may be thus understood; it is that power by which a man gives himself up to anything, seeks, wills, adheres to, and unites with it, so that his life lives in it, and belongs to it. Now to whatever the soul gives itself up; whatever it hungereth after; and in which it delights and seeks to be united; there, and there only, is its faith; that faith which can work either life or death, and according to which faith, everything is, and must be done to man.

If that were our understanding of faith, our divisions would soon disappear, for we would surrender our pride and self-opinion and our self-will to the one will of God Incarnate in Christ, and so be at one with Him and in Him that we might be fit to be His agents in bringing His world to Him.

In our sectarian quarrels and jealousy, we have lost sight of the fact that Christianity is above all the religion of love, of God's love for the world manifested through all His dealings recorded in history, and supremely manifested in the fact of the Incarnation. If

we were truly Christ's men, we would truly be filled with Christ's love for each other and for the world, and we would find that love is life, for love is selfless. We would find, too, that life is unity, as unity is life, and that faith is love and life, for faith is the complete surrender of oneself in boundless love that self may find fulfilment and glory in deeper and richer life.

Our theology ought all to be rewritten on the two notes that God is love and that the freedom of man is the crowning glory of God's creation of the world. If those were the fundamental notes of our lives, the world would be a very different place. Life is corporate, for no man can really and fully live by himself, and so salvation, which is but the supreme expression and glory of love, is also corporate. We are saved from self and all the evils which flow from selfishness, and which dwarf and throttle the life which Christ stands ready to impart to us, by participation in the life of Christ communicated to the world through the Church which is His Body.

In every man-made Utopia there is no place for sin or sorrow or suffering, and the result is a dead world, peopled only by puppets. God's plan was to create a free world, making man capable of being His friend and partner, and giving man the free choice to work with Him for the accomplishment of His purpose, or to neglect or seek to thwart that purpose.

The Church is the divine organism, created by God through Christ to bring the world to its Saviour, and Christ the Head of that Body is waiting in infinite love and patience to do His perfect work until we, the members of that Body, are willing to surrender our wills to His and let Him fill us with grace and power to bring His world to Him. "Thy will be done" is not the expression of a hopeless resignation, but the supreme act of the strong, free man by which he puts himself in harmony with the infinite and eternal will of God and so brings down to himself power from on high to labor for the establishment of the Kingdom.

The Commission of the Episcopal Church has published a number of pamphlets dealing with various aspects of the World Conference and a Manual of Prayer for Unity, all of which may be had free on application to the Secretary, Robert H. Gardiner, Post-Office Box 436, Gardiner, Me., U. S. A. All who desire it are entered on a mailing list to which the publications of the Commission are sent.

We have not yet begun to consider the real nature of the necessity for the visible reunion of Christians. It is no mere question of expediency, or of economy of time, of strength or of money. The visible unity of Christians is the potent evidence necessary to convince the convert mankind to the Lord of life and love.

We sometimes do not appreciate how intensely practical our Lord was. If we would see that He staked the conversion of the world to the recognition of His mission from the Father on the visible unity of His followers, we would see that we cannot allow anything to stand in the way of the fulfilment of His prayer.

Our self-opinion is largely based on ignorance of the grounds of our convictions or, at most, on hasty and superficial consideration of the deep matters of God and His relation to the world. We ought all to follow, humbly and faithfully, the advice given by Dr. Moëhler, in his "Symbolism," that we should study our own convictions fearlessly and faithfully, so that we may see on what they are based and understand them thoroughly. With such a knowledge of our own convictions, we shall then be in a position to study with appreciation and humility the convictions of our brethren, for, if we have examined our own convictions deeply and in Christian humility and love, they will then not be stumbling-blocks and rocks of offence in the way of our brethren, but living forces bringing to bear upon our brethren the power of the Christian faith. We shall find also that in their con-

victions, which in our ignorance we have scorned, there is much of great value to us in making more complete and more profound our grasp of the whole Christian faith. We shall find, too, that the differences which they and we think are sufficient to keep us apart in separate, and often in hostile, camps, to the scandal of the world and the impairment, if not the destruction, of the efficiency of the Church of Christ, are neither as numerous nor as insuperable as we have supposed in our ignorance of each other.

Too often we construct our own theology without regard to the history of God's revelation of Himself, not only through the Bible, but through the saints and prophets in whom He has specially revealed Himself all through the history of the world. Too often we have scorned the teaching of the Church throughout previous centuries and so have lost much of the wisdom and devotion with which God the Holy Ghost has filled the lives of many a saint and prophet.

It may be that the traditional theology current among theologians to-day is too formal and rigid and needs to be translated into the language of to-day and brought into channels which shall meet and solve to-day's problems. If so, it is our fault. We have forgotten that theology is the science of the living God indwelling in His world and we have not sought to know Him as He is.

We are too impatient. We think that the divisions of centuries can be cured in a few months, or a few days. We are always seeking short cuts, but a short cut seldom leads to anything except a wandering from the way. The divisions of centuries can only be healed by long and patient effort, and, hard as may be the road, we must travel it with infinite patience.

But the first thing we need is penitence—deep, soul-compelling penitence—not for the sins of our brethren, but for our own. It is our own self-assertion and pride

of opinion, our impatience, and our ignorance not only of the deep things of God, but of the treasures which lie hidden from our sight in the truths held by our brethren, which keep Christians apart from the one Body of the one Lord. We need, first, that penitence for our own sins which shall recreate us and, making us humble as little children, enable us to put ourselves in harmony with the one will of God. That means prayer such as we have never known; not prayer that all the world may be brought to agree with us, but prayer which shall be the absolute surrender of our poor finite wills; which shall be the upreach of heart and mind and soul to the infinite and eternal will of God that we may make His will ours, and so be filled with grace and strength for the accomplishment of His purpose. It is not we who can convert the world to Christ. All that we can do is to lift Him up before the world that He may bring the world to Him. Now we obscure from the world the vision of God Incarnate in Jesus Christ, hanging upon the Cross that He may teach us the glory of sacrifice, by the smoke and dust of our petty sectarian quarrels and the noise of our self-assertion. Kneeling together in deepest penitence at the foot of the Cross, we may let the world see the glory of the manifestation of the perfect love of God.

Robert H. Gardiner.

THE CATHOLIC AND PURITAN SPIRIT ESSENTIAL TO UNITY

By Albert James Collison, Minister in the Reformed Church, Trenton, N. J.

Every great change in the economic structure of society is always accompanied by corresponding changes and adjustments in its political, educational and religious institutions. Economics and religion react on each other in the aggregate of humanity as the brain and the mind interact in the individual. The law of correspondence always holds true. Every restudy of First Principles comes to the inevitable conclusion that the spiritual and the material are inseparably associated in human consciousness. Henri Bergson, the great French philosopher, gives this brief summary of his findings: "Spirit borrows from matter the perceptions upon which it feeds, and returns them in the form of movements stamped with its own freedom."

Thus every endeavor and struggle toward greater human freedom is a spiritual as well as a material achievement. Spirit in its essence is universal, unlimited, free. Intelligent order and material organization, in their very nature, are limitations by law imposed and accepted by free spirit. Out of this continuity of opposition between universal spirit and limited forms come the growth and the progress of the individual and of the race. The more widely and generally this is recognized the more does the character of the opposition change. Life is not necessarily a mad, destructive battle. It can be and it ought to be a glad constructive game. The difference between a game and a battle is not in the opposition itself but in the character of it. The game ceases and the battle begins when mutuality of obligation is for-

gotten. Nobility obliges. When it ceases to oblige, it is no longer nobility either of birth, position or character.

This opposition between free, universal spirit and the limitations of organized systems of thought, gives rise to two types of human and historical expression which may be broadly classified as Catholic and Puritan, respectively.

It is the aim of this contribution to trace out, in a broad and generous spirit, the difficult subject of the place of these two types in human society. It is our desire to show that both the Catholic and the Puritan spirit are necessary; that both have their value and place, yet also their dangers. And, if we realize that both are necessary, it may help each type to be tolerant as regards the other, and to see that each has its dangers.

All the world over these two types are found. They are, in fact, two marked temperaments, intellectual and emotional, into which, roughly, one may classify almost all thoughtful and educated people, and even the thoughtless and ignorant, for those also will show similar types, although naturally less attractively, because more extreme, than they may be among the class of people who at least are seeking to understand themselves and to gain some measure of equilibrium.

Looked at from the outside, the Catholic type is the more attractive, and, therefore, we must emphasize the value of the Puritan type, because, being less attractive, its value is more likely to be overlooked. If the Puritan spirit were completely lost, mankind would lack that vigor and strength and tendency to free thought and free judgment which are so essential to human evolution. Unfortunately, it has often been united with a very cold and forbidding exterior, and, if we take the two types as we find them in the reign of Charles I., certainly the Puritan is not very attractive from the outside; hard, rather sour, forbidding and austere. But it is not fair to judge Puritans by that type in the reign of the Stuarts.

It is not fair to pick out a type where these two difficulties face it—danger to itself and the extreme evil of the type it is opposing. It is hardly fair to take circumstances for a judgment of the value of the temperament in itself. But even if you take the Puritan of the time of Charles I., and of Cromwell, you can hardly help noticing, if you go beyond externals, the extreme moral value of that type amid those difficult and dangerous surroundings. Austere as it was, it was the austerity that was trying to guard itself against continual danger of pollution, and naturally it ran into extremes, as all reactions run, with the inevitable result that another reaction followed on the first, and you had the loose and profligate type of the Court of Charles II. We need to learn how to disentangle the types from their special manifestations and associations, and to look at them apart from all conditions that may unduly emphasize one characteristic or another.

Now, in what does the Puritan type exactly consist? It seems to consist in an attitude of protest and criticism rather than of ready acceptance of the prevailing thought of the time. The Puritan mind is essentially critical, and critical in the modern sense of the term, which, instead of making the critic a judge, makes him an opponent and condemner. We must remember that the true critical spirit is absolutely necessary for human progress, even though it often slips into condemnation and cynicism.

The Puritan is always intellectual, speaking of the purer type, a man in whom thought is predominant over feeling. He is of the type that tends to separation rather than unity; he stands alone, sufficient for himself. This is not the same as being "self-sufficient," which connotes a rather unpleasant quality in either type.

We must realize the strength of the Puritan type. This strength may slip into austerity, but that very largely grows out of the form of religion to which the Puritan may happen to be attached. We do not find him

in his more aggressive form unless he is protesting against something he regards as mischievous and dangerous. Naturally, under these considerations, he is thrown into the attitude of combat, and hence all that is harshest and most hostile comes to the surface. But that is not a necessary part of the Puritan spirit. Looking at him as the intellectual man in whom emotion is comparatively weak, or, if not weak, repressed; seeing that in him the mental qualities are those which he specially endeavors to develop; understanding that the mind can only be developed where the qualities of analyzing, comparing and judging are active, we can readily see how, in the face of opposition, these qualities would turn into protest and antagonism. But antagonism and protest are not a necessary part of the Puritan spirit. In peaceful times your Puritan is distinguished as the analytical or intellectual man, most valuable to any community into which he may be thrown at the time. For you cannot develop the mind without developing these analyzing qualities; synthesis comes later, the one belonging to the earlier, the other to maturer grades of mental culture. Both need to be developed. While the first is developing, you must have these qualities of analysis, comparison and judgment, without which it is not possible to lay a strong foundation for any belief.

We must recognize the utter necessity for the challenging, questioning, even doubting and sceptical spirit. Only by means of this can error be detected, and the traditions that come down from the past be gradually purified of the accretions that have come to them during the ignorant periods through which they may have passed. To be sceptical is no fault, but rather a virtue. If there is to be progress at all, there must be challenging of that which has come down from the past, so that testing, analyzing, criticizing, you may be able to separate the truth from the error. How would life become ever more and more spiritual if men are only to inherit and

never to examine and understand? And since no religion or other form of thought can ever come down through centuries without picking up a large amount of error, if we had not this critical and challenging spirit all religions would grow into superstitions, and that which is most valuable for the race would gradually be covered under a mass of ignorant error. Hence at certain times in the history of the race a great outburst of the Puritan spirit is necessary. That alone will bring about fundamental changes, religious, moral and social; that alone has the courage to go forward while in a minority, and test with the test of reason every belief and every tradition. We must not, then blind ourselves to the immense value of this spirit in the intellectual development of man. For always, inasmuch as religious and social order has come by a divine Teacher enormously beyond his own generation in religious, moral and social development, inevitably his teachings, handed down generation after generation, will in many respects tend to be covered with superstition. In the centuries between Moses and Christ, this tendency manifested itself many times, and in the centuries since Christ it has not ceased.

What does the word "superstition" really mean? An old definition is that "superstition is the taking of the non-essential as the essential." That covers all the cases we would call superstitious—a truth originally; but in every truth there are necessary and accessory parts. As the understanding of the truth is clouded, the accessories take on too large a value in the minds of the people, until at last the accessory is everything and the essential nothing.

A story from India marks out clearly what is superstition. There was once a very holy man in the habit of offering a sacrifice by pouring butter into the fire—one of the ordinary Hindu ceremonies. Morning after morning he duly performed this rite. He was much admired by his neighbors, and the regularity of the discharge of his

religious duties led them to consider him a model worthy of imitation. This good man happened to have a cat. As he was kind-hearted and affectionate, the cat loved him, and used to come up and interrupt his religious service; so he put a collar around the cat and tied it to the bedpost to prevent interruptions. Time went on, a few generations passed, and then all of the people who copied this admirable saint not only offered the sacrifice, but also considered it a part of the rite to have a cat tied to the bedpost. Still more time went on, until at last all that remained of the original ceremony was the cat tied to the bedpost and nothing else.

Now there is superstition: the harmless accessory had become necessary, until it occupied the whole of the worshipers' minds. This is often the case in religions which have lasted long, and have had many ignorant adherents. They cannot distinguish between the inner meaning and the outer form; and gradually the outer form becomes everything, and the inner meaning disappears. Then comes the time when, superstition having taken the place of truth, there rises up the critical intellect of man, attacks the whole, and challenges the authority. Only sometimes the critic is not evolved enough to recognize the truth at the same time that he wars against the error. More often he takes the whole as superstition and tries to destroy it completely.

There you have the history of many reformations. Take the great Reformation of the sixteenth century. If you look back to that you will see that an enormous amount of valuable truth was thrown aside in trying to get rid of the surface error with which the truth had been covered. And so in tracing down the growth of the Puritan spirit from the time of Luther, through Calvinistic Switzerland, up to Scotland with John Knox, and then looking at it as it spread over England, and became so powerful under James I. and Charles I., you will recognize that in the whole of that there is a gradual throw-

ing away of everything that the mind could not grasp and understand and consequently a great loss of the spiritual side of things. The result of that historically has been that the truth that was thrown away in the getting rid of the error came back again later.

And so with certain fundamental tendencies in men, against which the Puritan of that time set himself utterly—the use of images in public worship, the use of music, the use of garments different from the every-day garments, and so on—all these points that the Puritan threw aside as "Papal abominations," came back again, slowly, steadily, gradually spreading through the whole of the Anglican Church.

So that we have this remarkable object lesson, which it would be well for all Puritan-spirited people to remember. In a visit to an English cathedral to-day, one may see outside the statues that were broken by Cromwell's soldiery! and inside the cathedral, on or around the high altar and chancel, you will see the modern statues placed there in order to help the devotional spirit in the congregation.

If we can see the value of the Puritan spirit in general, we will welcome its presence in the particular associations with which we are most closely related. We will realize that that spirit is wanted in order to balance and keep in check what might otherwise be the excess of the Catholic spirit. Those of the Catholic spirit who revere long established authority, who would see and conserve all the good of the past, will realize that their critical friends are performing an immense service in their criticism, and that it only becomes mischievous when the critical spirit grows into antagonism and dislike, which need not at all accompany it, and should not accompany it in a well balanced and thoughtful mind. We must have that spirit amongst us, otherwise the enthusiast will run away too rapidly and fall into error. The chill that sometimes it causes is a very valuable element for men-

tal growth. We do not want to have nothing but chill, that will prevent growth altogether, but if we were more tolerant with each other, then we might have the advantage of the chill, which would keep the intellectual atmosphere clear and sharp, without having the very life chilled out of us by criticism.

Let us now pause on what we mean by the Catholic spirit. By that, I mean the spirit which is reverent of tradition, which is willing to submit to reasonable and recognized authority, which is willing to take a great plan and coöperate in it, and realize that the presence of the architect of the plan, if he be a person of sublime endowment, a master in wisdom, power and love, is enough to give it authority, and that there is no lack of freedom or dignity in accepting the plan of a greater, and working it out to the utmost of one's ability. It is the spirit which, largely emotional, when it rises into love of the higher and becomes devotion, causes sympathetic vibrations on the plane of what Emmanuel Kant called the "transcendant ego of perception," and so begins the awakening of the spirit above the intellect, purifying and clarifying its lower self-seeking aspects.

With this Catholic spirit you always find the love of beauty. It is artistic. It seeks to clothe thought in beautiful forms. It loves ceremonial, takes a pleasure in harmonized expression of thought, and desires that everything around it should be emotionally satisfactory as well as intellectually sound. Moreover, its mind is eminently teachable, in ways in which the Puritan is not. The Catholic mind very readily recognizes that those above itself in development may be able by guidance and teaching to help it to reach knowledge which, unaided, it would be unable to achieve. The Puritan would walk alone; the Catholic would utilize every assistance that can be given in evolution, including the assistance of human beings more highly developed, as well as of spiritual intelligences. And so you have round it an atmos-

phere which readily responds to impulses from the spiritual worlds, and always with this spirit you find the tendency toward belief and discovery of hidden spiritual realities, of various kinds.

That tendency is seldom found in connection with the Puritan spirit. You may find with the Puritan spirit sometimes a lofty form of mysticism, a recognition of a spirit as the life of the universe, and an attempt to realize that spirit within oneself. That you may reach largely by way of the intellect, and emotion is not necessarily concerned in it. Intellectually you may realize unity, and then pass into the mystical ideal of the one in the many, the counterpart in the universe, of what is expressed in the motto on the Great Seal of the United States of America: *"E Pluribus Unum,"* one nation in many states; many states in one nation; the one life of the universe to be recognized in each individual. And you do find occasionally in the great Puritans of the past a very noble, though somewhat stern and cold form of mystical belief; whereas the moment you come to Catholic mysticism, you find yourself in an atmosphere charged with emotion. The Catholic mystic is swept up in a great surge of emotion to the object of his love; the Puritan mystic calmly, almost coldly, recognizes the greatness of the object of his worship, intellectually tries to realize, and by that to some extent unifies himself with it. We have an example of the Puritan mystic in Cromwell. Read the letters of the man, wrung out of his heart by the strain of doubts and despair, and clinging, in spite of all temptation, to his belief in the reality of a divine power whose instrument he was. You will rise from that reading with a new idea of the strength of the man, and realize that with all that strength there was a recognition of the strength of God and of his own strength as being only an instrument in the divine hands.

But we ever find the Puritan mystic the expression of love, of passionate affection, that is so common among

the Catholic mystics. The classic type of this spirit is St. Francis of Assisi. Every fear and doubt and despair is cast out in an all-absorbing universal love. To follow his contemplations of nature and nature's God uplifts and recreates in us inexpressible feelings of universal goodness. The mind is stilled and the heart keeps rhythmic time in tune with the infinite. For Francis and his fellows the way to unity is realized by the development of the sense of universal kinship. The sun was his brother, the moon and the stars his sisters. The seasons, the grass, the trees and the birds, as well as the wind and air and cloud; he loved the water and fire as sister and brother of his, and praised the earth as our mother and prayed that the love and the life of nature might ever lift us higher and nobler in devotion and joy with God.

In the great and rapidly changing world order that is upon us, it is not to be expected that these opposite types will not come into conflict with each other. And yet we may confidently expect that the experiences and teaching of past history will be so reinforced by the lessons of the *"kulturkampf"* or culture conflict, reflected in the great war, that the reconstruction period following it will be free from virulent antagonisms, and sufficiently purified to enable us to render our various contributions to the new world order in such a way that all that is valuable for the generations to come, in both the Puritan and Catholic type, may be preserved and the dangers in each be reduced to their minimum.

Here, then, is our practical problem for the future: To realize that within ourselves there is something of both the Catholic and Puritan elements, varying in each, as the one may be dominant over the other. And that these devotional and rational elements are essential parts of every human being. To seek their equilibrium within ourselves and in our contacts with our fellows is to reduce the conflict within our own souls and to aid the com-

ing of brotherhood as the general rule and practise of life. To cultivate that equilibrium is a life work. A daily and yearly discipline that shall keep us to the end.

As we learn to recognize these opposites in ourselves and in our fellows more clearly, we find in the Catholic mind a looking up of reverence, an outstretching hand for guidance, a realization that by dependence help and progress may come more rapidly. That which is invisible exercises a potent attraction; and there is a trying to know something of the invisible worlds and their inhabitants by reaching out toward these worlds and seeking to expand the consciousness into communion or communication with them. This mind is willing to train himself with this end in view, and, therefore, has possibilities not found in the Puritan type. For knowledge of these things does not begin along purely intellectual lines. Intellectual exertion checks the evolution of these modes of understanding. The moment the mind begins to think: "What am I doing? Is it imagination? Is it hallucination?" the subtler faculties of devotion are checked. The devotional spirit is obliged for a time to go on without questions, feeling, sensing, groping and refusing to allow the mind to come in with its analyzing chill, cooling down these budding faculties, as it were, so that they shrink back from the touch of the frost. "Well," says the rational mind, "there is a danger. The person may become over-credulous, may be utterly led astray." True. It is the necessary danger of all progress. Only step by step do we learn by experience to distinguish between the true and the false, between symbols and that which is symbolized, between idols and ideals. The deceptions of the imagination can only be outgrown by experience, exactly in the same way that the baby learns that it cannot reach the glittering thing at the end of the room, but to catch hold of it, must cover a great deal of space. We do not think it heartbreaking because the baby makes mistakes. We are con-

tent that he shall learn. Why not be as philosophical about the dangers of the Catholic type?

There is another danger—the dependence on another. How can independence and judgment and self-reliance be developed when one is always relying upon a superior? The answer is simple. The devotional mind may look to a superior for direction and be given some duty or work to be done. The work is taken because the higher has given it. So far you are the obedient servant; but your judgment, your reason, all your thought-power, all your initiative, may be taxed to the utmost in the achievement of the task. Devotion to a higher power does not require one to be told "how shall I do this"; it is enough at times to be told "do that." How you do it tests you and brings out your strength and weakness. And one who has the spirit of the Master is far too wise to prevent your bringing out your strength and discovering your weakness by doing for you what He has told you to do. Hence the devotee may develop all his faculties in the attempt to do the Master's will. The two things work well together, and he does not become weak but strong in realizing that the Master is greater than he, and knows far better the plan of the work, while he himself, in carrying out his own portion of it, finds full employment for every faculty of brain as well as heart.

How, then, will these two types of spirit work when it comes to questions dealing with human personalities? You will have at once the working of the critical intelligence of the Puritan type which sees faults more readily than virtues and bad motives more readily than good. That is its weakness. But its value lies in pointing out certain dangers into which the person or persons might otherwise slip. The Catholic spirit will be more ready to overlook the faults and the failures and to assume that there may be some other reason which they do not see, which would justify to the doer what he has done, and not feel that sense that they must save their neigh-

bors' souls whether their neighbors desired it or not. They will be content to say "this is my road, that is his"—a wide and generous spirit.

We need to study our own nature more and find out our weak points, and then to guard against that weakness in time of storm and stress. We need to realize, perhaps more than that, that when people oppose us, they oppose us because of their virtues, and not because of their vices. They may be wrong in the view they take; they may misconstrue; that does not matter so much as it does for us to recognize the fundamental reason for their opposition, their belief that we are doing or condoning that which is wrong. That is a good feeling and a right one. It runs into evil when it goes into hatred and calumny and uses falsehoods as a weapon to injure. If we can recognize the beginnings of opposition in a virtue, even when the opposition has run into excess; if we can do that, then, in the midst of struggle, we shall be learning the true spirit of brotherhood, which sees the good first, and only recognizes the excess afterward.

To train ourselves, in our ordinary thinking, to see first the good of a person or thing, and only afterward to allow ourselves to see the weakness or evil, will get us all the good out of our critical spirit and guard us against much harm. For if we see the bad side first we are not likely to see the good side at all. These things test us and show whether we are fittingly prepared to take our place in the next great step in human evolution, a world order in which the keynote will be brotherhood—unity, fraternity and coöperation.

We need a wider tolerance, a sterner self-criticism, and a more charitable attitude toward our fellows. We cannot be too sternly Puritanical toward ourselves nor too broadly Catholic toward our neighbors.

In each one the Universal Self is endeavoring to find expression and mastery over the lower self. In our own

case we have the right to criticize every obstacle put in the way of His manifestation, to be hard in our judgment of ourselves, pitiless in our condemnation of our every fault and weakness. But we cannot govern the manifestation of the self in another; hence our condemnation is useless and impertinent—does not help but hinders; for if the other person is wrong, as you think he is, then your harsh judgment makes an added barrier in his way when the self in him is trying to guide him back to the right, whereas your charity, your tolerant respect, will help him to realize the noblest in him.

To seek this highest self in ourself and in every other self is the noblest work of man. It is the supreme obligation of nobility and the test of its genuineness.

The writer desires to acknowledge his obligation to Annie Besant for part of the thought of the preceding article, expressed in her lectures for 1909 and published under the title of "The Changing World."

ALBERT JAMES COLLISON.

PRESENT DUTY OF THE DISCIPLES IN REGARD TO CHRISTIAN UNITY

By George William Brown, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament History in the College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.

The *raison d'etre* of the Disciples is the furtherance of Christian union. The present movement originated a little over a century ago, and the persons most prominently connected with this phase of the movement were Thomas and Alexander Campbell. Others were associated with them. Like all other reformers, this group of men did not undertake to reform all things; they accepted most of the things they found in existence, but sought to find some plan whereby the Church might be reunited. Up to their time no one had seriously given attention to this problem, at least no one had made the attempt to solve the problem of unity in the way they made it. Their predecessors had started out with the assumption that certain sects or communions were right and had the whole truth. It was therefore the duty of all outside of that Communion to renounce their errors and unite with the Communion. Various means to compel uniformity, such as the inquisition, numerous discriminations in favor of the established Church, and the like, were adopted in different places. But with the Disciples the case was different. The plan was to plead with people to be one. The leaders were intensely stirred by the spectacle of divided Christendom. While naturally inclined more toward the faith they had been holding for years than toward any other, their attitude even toward their old beliefs was that they should be subjected to criticism to determine whether they stood in the way of Christian union.

Led on by the desire to see the Church reunited, these men began a search for what might be the acceptable

basis of Christian union. Their reasonings led them to the conclusion that the only basis on which the Church could be reunited, was the restoration of primitive Christianity. Among the reasons which led to this conclusion were these. In the earlier days the Church had been united. The basis of that Church had been laid by Christ and His apostles. They had been divinely led and guided. When men began to depart from the principles set forth by these founders, when they began to introduce new doctrines and practises, division took place. The one and only way to unite the Church was to return to these primitive conditions. It was the duty of all believers to give up whatever was contrary to the doctrines and practises of the early Church, and to return to the pristine simplicity of that Church. For the reformers not only felt that the reunion of the Church was an advisable thing; they had come to feel that it was an imperative thing. Instead of putting into the background that prayer of Christ which is recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, they brought it to the forefront, and urged that those who failed to live up to the spirit of that prayer were not doing their full duties as Christians. Reunion was the paramount duty of Christians.

Having become convinced that the Church could be united only on the basis of a return to New Testament conditions, the next step was to determine what were the conditions of the New Testament Church. The path led them back past all the Councils held at the behest of pope or emperor, and to the setting aside as irrelevant of all the creeds and confessions adopted during the centuries of Christianity and the putting aside of the Fathers as authoritative. Not that they felt that these were antichristian. But all these were newer than the original Church, and sometimes they had introduced innovations which were actually schismatic and harmful. At best they were unnecessary in determining the true

policy of the Church. The conditions of the true and united Church were to be found in the inspired pages of the New Testament.

Necessarily the Disciples began an earnest and thorough study of the New Testament. The essential features they discovered to be faith, repentance, confession, baptism, and the leading of a godly life. More and more the Scriptures were resorted to to answer all the questions which arose in connection with the Church. Scriptural baptism was found to be immersion on the profession of faith; hence infant baptism was not Scriptural baptism. The early Church did not have bishops in the Roman Catholic and Anglican sense. The bishop or elder was an official in the local Church. He had no jurisdiction over any other Church. Each Church possessed a plurality of elders. There was a board of deacons also to assist in the conduct of affairs. Each Church possessed autonomy; no ecclesiastical system had authority over the individual churches. There was no formal creed or confession; the only question asked in the New Testament in regard to one's faith was the one Jesus asked, to which Peter replied, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Sectarian names were to be avoided and only Scriptural terms used to designate believers.

This simple platform appealed to a large number of earnest people and the number of Disciples, until recently, has grown rapidly. Logically, the emphasis was placed in the following order: the need and importance of Christian union, the all sufficiency of the Scriptures, and adult baptism, as the sign of entering the Church. The emphasis on baptism was at first only incidental to the greater matter of Christian union. But it is the history of all such movements that they tend to get away from their early forms, and that the emphasis is shifted from the main to some minor theme. Baptism has loomed larger and larger, and the

plea for union has tended to recede more and more into the background. One hears far fewer sermons on that theme than were heard only a half generation ago. In some cases perhaps the preacher does not really know what the plea of the Disciples is. In other cases he may know the plea, but cannot present it in a way which appeals to his congregation. It may even be that he cannot present it in a way to appeal to himself, or at least to satisfy himself. The result of this is reflected in the congregation. Ask the average Disciple, "What do the Disciples stand for?" and he will probably name two or three things, such as baptism of believers only, and by immersion, local autonomy of the Churches, plurality of elders, Scriptural names. If you ask him about Christian union, he will of course say that is part of the programme of the Disciples, but he can never be as clear and definite in regard to it as he can in regard to other matters.

Naturally this produces its effect on the world outside. The Disciples are not looked on as propagandists for Christian union, but simply as one out of a number of sects. Disciples are vaguely classed as a sort of Baptists by a great many people. Very few indeed are aware that the Disciples have made or have attempted to make, any real contribution to the cause of Christian union. There are some Disciples who have begun to feel much the same in regard to themselves. It is their feeling that the Disciples have ceased to have a message for the world of to-day. It is not that there is no need of Christian union. But Disciples have ceased to make that the main part of their propaganda, and are content to urge other things. Through lack of some distinctive message, divisive elements have crept into the movement, and energy is being spent in the discussion of such things as the interpretation of the Bible, our attitude toward the unimmersed, Church government, baptism, loyalty, orthodoxy and the like. Those who feel thus are anxious

to improve the situation, but so far have not seen the way open to do so. Some with whom I have talked feel that unless the Disciples rehabilitate their original plea and present a strong, positive programme looking toward Christian union, their usefulness is over.

Undoubtedly all Disciples will not subscribe to all the opinions mentioned above. Nevertheless, all will admit that the movement has not accomplished all that was hoped for it. There are many who feel that there is a real lack of distinctiveness in the doctrines proclaimed by the Disciples; not the doctrines which the plea calls for, but those which are actually preached. Each of the great denominations has something distinctive for which it stands and which it emphasizes. It is some great doctrine, or perhaps mere denominationalism. The Disciples cannot acclaim baptism as their great message; the Baptists are calling attention to that. Nor are they alone in their views on Church government or creeds. The Disciples *do* have a distinctive message, greater than any of these—the plea for the reunion of the Church. But while this is theoretically true, in practice this plea has largely fallen into the background. Not to present this plea is in every way a strategic mistake. The world was never more ready to listen to it than it is now. But it needs to be presented not only with force, but also in a way to appeal to the mind of the present.

Perhaps it was inevitable that the emphasis of the movement should be shifted. There is always the likelihood that men who take up a great movement will not conceive it and its doctrines in the same way as did those who were the founders of the movement. Many reforms and new ideas have been altered from this cause in such a way as to be unrecognizable. Then there was another element which has gone far to shift and stereotype the message of the Disciples. To the originators of the movement the Bible was the source of authority. The principles of the reformers were demonstrated by

direct appeals to the sacred Book. It is easy to carry a thing of this kind too far. It is easy to fall into a sort of super-reverence for the Book, while the spirit is made to suffer accordingly. And there is also such a thing as being too logical. Logic has always been the bane of religion. Its cold methods, if applied continually, tend to freeze the Spirit. The early Disciples were great debaters, and their logic was incontestable. But now that the Bible is not regarded in exactly the same light in which it was regarded a century ago, owing to changing views in regard to inspiration, the legalistic type of mind is not found to the same extent as formerly. The old argumentative methods fail to convince, as they formerly did. It is evident that the Disciples are not reaching the present generation. It is also patent that the Disciples are not conserving their gains as formerly. There is much shifting to other religious bodies. The numbers are being kept up now more because of the evangelistic fervor of Disciples than because of the presentation of the plea for union. The failure of the Disciples to accomplish what the founders of the movement hoped is undoubtedly due to failure to recognize the new age in which we are living and to adopt methods to this age. The old method of moving men does not usually appeal to the mind of to-day. Hence the call to rehabilitate the plea.

The situation, then, imperatively demands that we lay renewed emphasis on the subject of Christian union, and that we do so in the spirit of the times. Sheer logic is not as convincing as it was some years ago. The world is not in the same legalistic attitude that it once was, and appeals made to that spirit will not be heeded. We shall not find people as literalistic as we once did, and they will not be ready to do a thing because it seems to be a literal command of the Bible, or because it appears to be an approved precedent. The argument which will be listened to must not only appeal to the

hearer's reason, but must also have some practical value as well.

What the times particularly demand is that we make a complete reinvestigation of the whole question of Christian union. To do this is not to be in the least disloyal to the memory of the men who originated the movement for the restoration of primitive Christianity. Those men would be the last to assume that they had completed the task and that nothing could be added to what they had done, nothing taken from the conclusions which they had accepted. They could do nothing more than to encourage the same spirit of free investigation which animated them. In fact, not to continue the investigations which they began would be more disloyal to them than to continue them. Neither we nor they feel that the originators of the restoration movement were infallible. Neither we nor they feel their conclusions have the binding force of a creed. Even the methods which they employed may be questioned, and if found objectionable in any way, dropped and new methods employed. We cannot conceive of those godly men advocating any other course than the free investigation of the Scriptures and of the method of Christian union. We cannot be loyal to them unless we avail ourselves of our liberty.

The great problem before the Disciples therefore seems to be a reinvestigation of the whole problem of Christian union. The need and the duty of effecting union is not called into question; when we question this we cease to be Disciples, and our proper place is one of the many denominations to be found on every hand. But we may investigate everything connected with the plan for union. Is the restoration of the primitive Church the only way for reuniting the Church? Is it God's way? If this be the right way to go about reuniting the Church, what were the features of the primitive Church? How many of these are possible to-day?

How many are essential and how many are not essential? How may we draw the line as to what to include and what to omit? How may we determine just what were the details of any practice or doctrine held by the early Church? These are the lines which an investigation should follow.

To determine the exact practises of the early Church is not an easy matter. It requires a most careful study of early Church history, and the sifting of a mass of varied material for occasional obscure references. In many matters we learn that the custom of the early Church must have been divided. In such case we must either follow one out of the ways discovered, or else reject the point as non-essential. Have we rightly estimated the early state of the Church, and are we right in considering many things innovations which ought not to be followed?

When we have determined what are the exact principles of the early Church, which of them are we to follow and which to reject to-day? Some of the customs mentioned in the Bible we have never adopted. "Greet one another with a holy kiss" was never in vogue in Disciples' congregations. Paul said, "I permit not a woman to teach nor to have dominion over a man." A literal interpretation of this would not only exclude women speakers from any of our religious services and conventions; it would rob us of most of our Sunday school teachers and abolish the Christian Woman's Board of Missions. True, reverting to the fact mentioned above, that the practise of the early Church in some matters and places does not seem to have been universal, we may drop this example on the ground that Philip had four daughters who prophesied. But this raises a doubt in one's mind. Here is an instance in which the Bible itself records different practises: how many cases of divergent practise were there which are not recorded? We do not consider binding the injunction

of Paul that women keep their heads covered in meeting; in fact, women are sometimes requested to remove their hats. Some practises we observe, but not in the way in which the early Church observed them. Any one who reads Paul's criticisms of the Corinthian Church will be convinced that we do not observe the Lord's Supper in the same way that Church did. True, Paul rebuked them. But there is no reason for thinking that after their rebuke they adopted the method which we now follow. And so one might mention other matters in which we have not consistently followed the practise of the early Church.

How rigidly we are to follow the practices of the early Church is not an easy question to answer. Once we adopt the platform to follow those practises, we must show good and convincing reasons for omitting any practises. On what principle do we reject any of the practises of the early Church? Are we clear on this point? Is not this a matter which we might profitably investigate? And when we have determined the grounds on which we deviate from some practises of the Church, the question will inevitably arise, are these all the practises covered by the principle of exclusions?

Of course, the practical bearing is this: are we insisting on some unnecessary things as essential, and in this way hindering some from joining in a Christian union movement? No programme will be a right programme in which a desire to have our own way, to carry our own points, to make people think as we think, takes a more prominent place than the desire to unite the Church. The moment Christian union takes a secondary position in our minds, we become mere denominationalists. Are our activities ever based on party spirit and a desire to have big numbers? If this is the motive, we have ceased to be Disciples. Hence the necessity of reexamining our position that we may see whether we are insisting on things which are purely

Scriptural, and if they are Scriptural, whether they are things which the Scriptures and the early Church really considered necessary. It is a well-known statement of Disciple speakers, that the more planks one puts into a religious platform, the fewer people can stand on it. It is necessary that we put no unnecessary planks into our platform.

A merely logical position, too, demands that we investigate this matter very carefully. We claim to reject all human creeds and to accept only the New Testament as our rule of faith and practise. Are you really doing this, I have been asked, or are you simply presenting your own interpretation of the New Testament? I have my interpretation, says the objector, and I abide by it; I see no difference between your position and mine. If we are to depend on logic in the presentation of our platform, we must abide by logic. We have to meet the logical objections raised by others. But the better way would be to reduce to a minimum the number of points concerning which dispute is likely. A reinvestigation of the question of conditions of Christian union would help us to think clearly on these lines, and if we are now insisting on any unnecessary things, reveal to us what they are, that we might no longer offend by presenting them.

Careful investigation will show to us that there are many other things concerning which the custom of the early Church does not seem to have been uniform, and that persons of different prepossessions will interpret a given custom or practise in many different ways. Practically all the denominations claim Scriptural sanction for what they practise. Certainly some of them must be wrong. The practical question with us now is this, how can we infallibly determine just what were the practises of the early Church, and just how far are they kept inviolable? When we can answer this to the satisfaction, not of ourselves, but of others, we shall

have gotten a long way on the road to Christian union.

But we might even go back a step further in our investigations. Were the leaders of the restoration movement right in their platform, the reunion of the Church on the platform of primitive Christianity? Were they right in thinking that this is the one and only way, the only right way, in which Christendom can be reunited? Again, I repeat, a reinvestigation of this question is not an act of disloyalty. Let us view the matter in the light of the twentieth century.

It is well to recall to mind again that the primary purpose of the Disciples' movement is the reunion of the divided Church. The particular platform on which it is to be reunited has to be determined, and is therefore a secondary thing. The leaders of the Disciples' movement carefully investigated the question, and finally came to the conclusion that the Church could be reunited only by returning to the state of the primitive Church. Were they right in this? Have we not the same right, nay, is it not a duty as incumbent on us as it was on them to go into this question and decide it? One of the great causes of denominationalism is that people have inherited certain beliefs and practises, and have retained them simply because they were inherited. The assumption is that these dogmas and practises are right simply because they are inherited; they were determined to be right by a previous generation, and to question them is disloyal. People do not think of the changing conditions which make many inherited customs and dogmas out of place. Are we Disciples to follow in their footsteps, or are we to keep the one great purpose of reuniting the Church ever before us, and to keep ever on the outlook in regard to means and platform?

There are several reasons why a reinvestigation of this question is a timely one. It is the duty of every generation to settle great questions for itself. Unless

this is done, the present generation cannot have a full and complete understanding of the matters at issue. Why do preachers fail to present the subject of Christian union to their Churches? Why is it that this subject is rarely discussed in a constructive manner in our religious press? Is it not because it is not understood? We must cease to think that the matter was settled a century ago, once for all, and make a new inquiry into it. If our investigations lead to the conclusion that the platform proposed is a right one, and that the one method of reuniting the Church is to return to primitive conditions, we shall then be able to preach this doctrine heart and soul. If we come to a different conclusion, then it is our duty as Disciples to abandon our present position and adopt the one which seems right. Our great end is not to prove or maintain any particular dogma. That is the work of the denominations. Our work is to reunite the Church.

Another reason why we should reinvestigate the problem of Christian union is that we have failed to impress the world. There are many outside the ranks of the Disciples who are earnestly longing for the reunion of the Church. Most of these have not yet recognized that the Disciples have done anything of large value toward reuniting the Church. Many outside the body of Disciples will not admit that we have done anything. Some even feel that our plea for the union of the Church is a very specious one, and that under that guise we are seeking to build up another denomination. Now the fact that such opinions are held, and that we have failed to get the ear of the religious world does not prove that the reunion of the Church is an undesirable thing, nor does it prove that our platform is wrong. But it is evident that *something* is wrong. It *may* be our platform, it *may* be our methods. Or it *may* be that the religious world is not interested enough in the subject of Christian union to investigate the matter or

to pay attention to anything we have to say. It may be that denominational prejudices have closed their ears. But this cannot be true in all cases. Granted that vast numbers of Christians, and some whole denominations are wholly absorbed in their own *isms,* that they are primarily denominationalists and secondarily Christians, the fact still remains that there are thousands of fair-minded people who are really longing for the reunion of the Church. Why have the Disciples failed to reach and impress them? We need to reinvestigate the subject so that we may have something to present, and a way to present it that will carry conviction. Let us determine anew how the Church may be united, and then, under the leadership of the Spirit of God, set about reunion. If we are really in earnest about the matter, we are bound to accomplish something.

Reinvestigation of the question of Christian union would help us to present the subject to others in a more acceptable way. Perhaps our failure to accomplish more than we have is due to a defective terminology. Perhaps we are not thinking in twentieth century terms. If so, we cannot speak in twentieth century terms nor reach twentieth century minds. The theological and philosophical formulæ of a century ago do not appeal to the thinkers of to-day. Even if the matter itself is right, it must be cast in the current forms of thought to be accepted. So it is incumbent on us to take anew the subject of union, and get right with the present generation. Perhaps an investigation would reveal that our original platform is the right one; that we have nothing to amend. Very well; we need to put that platform into such a shape that thinkers of to-day will respect it. When we preach on Christian union it must be in the irenical method and terms of the present, and not in the cold logical terms of the past. Such terms do not appeal to men now; there is a distrust of too much logic. Whatever our message is to be, it must be couched in terms of love, it must breathe the spirit of love. We must entreat

people to join in the movement for the union of the Church because they love the Lord and His desires, we must not tell them that unless they do as we do they are utterly wrong and thwarting the divine will. We must remember that the presentation of our platform is a *plea,* we are not cudgeling anyone with logical propositions. Going over the whole matter of union anew will enable us to meet the present situation. It will enable us to develop a line of thought and terms of thought which will be suited to this generation. It therefore becomes our duty to take up the matter afresh.

Perhaps a reinvestigation of the problem of union would help us solve another problem. From time to time some Disciple feeling that we are not accomplishing our task, or else lacking in enthusiasm for the plea of the Disciples, drifts away from us to some of the denominations. In some quarters this defection is underrated. Such people are considered to have been out of sympathy with us and our aims, and their departure is represented as a good thing. This attitude is wrong. Every such defection is a tragedy. It not only represents a loss on our part, but it shows clearly that we are in some way on the wrong track. We cannot take the ground that if one does not fully agree with us he ought to be in some other ranks. This is the spirit of denominationalism. No person ought to leave the ranks of the Disciples unless he is opposed to Christian union. But those who leave are not always opposed to Christian union. The platform, or the methods, or the practices of the Disciples do not satisfy them; the aim of the Disciples is approved. It is probable that in many such cases the trouble is an antiquated system, or at least what to them appears an antiquated terminology. If a reinvestigation of the problem of union will save such to us, then by all means let us take up the question seriously and earnestly.

The remedy lies in a renewed interest in the subject of union. It is remarkable how little attention is given

to this subject in our colleges. Perhaps not more than one or two of our educational institutions are really doing anything worth while in the study of the Disciples and their plea. This ought not to be. It is a disgrace to us. It evinces the utmost indifference to the plea we present. It explains the lack of interest and the lack of knowledge on the part of ministers and congregations. Every college in our brotherhood needs to take up this question and study it hard. Denominational colleges have their chairs and departments in which the particular doctrines or tenets peculiar to them are taught. Why is it that the Disciples, with a plea greater than that which can be presented by any other religious body, are so negligent of their birthright? We need to begin at the educational source of our system, and instill an enthusiasm that will reach to the farthest member in the whole brotherhood.

Every college we have should take up the subject of union in the most thorough and modern way. Students should be encouraged to write theses on the subject; not theses which will merely chronicle something which others have done, but which will have an outlook toward the future. In every college there should be a chair of Christian union, and the incumbent should be a leader in this field. The standard by which our colleges should be tested is the amount of constructive work they are doing in Christian union. Study in a modern way, beginning at the beginning, will alone interest our college men. But once they are interested they will preach with power. They will go before the world with a positive message which will win thousands. We shall no longer have preachers maintaining silence on this vital subject because they themselves do not understand it. By all means, let the colleges be encouraged to take up the investigation and teaching of Christian union.

Another agency which ought to be enlisted in the cause of Christian union is our religious press. Should even one of our larger religious papers, eschewing the

trivial, open its columns to a discussion of Christian union *de novo*, and lead its correspondents into a constructive method of dealing with the subject, untold good would be accomplished. On the whole, our religious press is lacking in the matter of constructive programme. The tendency is to magnify trifles, and to create division among the Disciples themselves, rather than be a means to general union. If anything ever is published on Christian union, it is usually a rehash of some well-worn article. Why is it that our editors give us the husks of a past generation, rather than feed us on fresh and invigorating food. Should they adopt a more vigorous and timely policy, they would certainly win back a large part of the prestige and influence which they have lost. And then they would have a part in God's programme which they are not now taking.

If then, our papers were to take up this question in a broad spirit, allowing every one to express his views, urging every one to inquire into the subject, publishing even the most bizarre views without bringing in the charge of heresy or condemning the writer, we might then hope to gain some new ideas and perhaps to receive a new message from God. Such a course would necessitate the giving up, for the time at least, the passion for orthodoxy. It would mean giving to every brother an opportunity to say what he thinks, without harsh or adverse censure, trusting ourselves to be led of God. It would stimulate thinking among the rank and file as well as among the leaders. It would tend to bring us all up to the twentieth century level, and not leave us stranded where our forefathers were a century ago. They did nobly. Let us build on their foundation, and thus make progress. We need the help of our papers. Probably they never had so great an opportunity to do a constructive work which would have its influence throughout all Christendom.

Then, our preachers need to feel the fire. They too need to realize the importance of the plea which is the

reason for the existence of the Disciples. They need to realize the importance of original thinking in this matter, and should not trust too blindly in the judgment of a past generation or lean too heavily on their staff. They should sense the situation and rise to it. Their pulpits should ring with live messages, messages containing new and vital thoughts, messages couched in the terms of the present and ringing with the enthusiasm of the present, filled with the inspiration of a newly discovered idea. Preachers must learn to place Christian union first in their programmes. There should be no denouncing of other Christians. Everything should be dominated by love and the Spirit of Christ. But the inquiry into the problem of union, and the preaching of the subject should ever be in the forefront. Nor should the preacher's labors end with preaching; on occasions he should practise union. The brotherhood as a whole must not take a jealous attitude if the Spirit of God moves in some camp other than our own, if some one who is not a Disciple devises and puts into practice some plan for union which we have not conceived. Again we must bear in mind the fact that our reason for a separate existence is the union of the Church, and we should rejoice whenever anything occurs which brings that end nearer.

The Disciples began well. The plea for union was the noblest call of its day. The first generation of Disciples went into the matter with enthusiasm. They elaborated a constructive programme. But their successors failed to keep up to the standard set. The work of the Disciples is suffering in consequence. The one remedy is to take up the problem of union in the same spirit which was manifested by the Campbells and their coadjutors, and fearless of consequences, with an unwavering trust in God, go on and work out a solution of the problem which is couched in present-day terms and adapted to the mind of the present generation.

George William Brown.

CHRISTIAN UNITY PULPIT

THE PROBLEM OF PROTESTANT UNITY

By JUNIUS B. REMENSNYDER, D.D., Pastor St. James' Lutheran Church, New York City.

TEXT.—"There is one Spirit . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all."—Eph. 4:4-6.

The four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation has evoked a celebration perhaps unexampled in Christian history. Despite the thunder of cannon, the clash of arms and the fields of human slaughter, millions in every land have gathered in their sanctuaries to commemorate it with an enthusiasm such as no civic memorial could inspire. This has given the world a practical illustration of the essential unity of Protestantism. Under its different phases, forms and organizations, there lies a generic agreement.

The old world and the new, Europe, the Americas, India, Africa and the Isles of the Sea, Protestants of every Church and name have joined in it with one heart and mind, forgetting all their minor differences as they proclaimed its vital truths. Does it not show Christians the practical possibility of a larger union—one world-wide Protestant Church of Christ? What joy, what inspiration, what strength this would give us all, and how it would speed forward the triumphant march of the Kingdom of God! Is not Protestant unity then, a *timely* theme, one that this united festival should urge upon every Christian's thought and conscience? Our text gives us a clear and emphatic expression of the standpoint of Scripture as to this duty. And no more urgent one can demand our attention.

In *nature* there is but one law, one force, one order,

one universal plan. Throughout space there is not the least jar or clash in this unity, or there would follow chaos, wreck, ruin. So in the world of spirit, the Scriptures declare that there is but one God, the Father of all the peoples of earth. So when He came who said: "One is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren," the estranged race was called back to this duty of harmony, fraternity and peace.

The first Christian centuries presented such a scene as had never been witnessed on earth since the exile from Eden. The disciples of Jesus in every land, and of every peculiarity of race and diversity of language, constituted but one family. They all belonged to the same Church and household of God. No differences of faith estranged them, no divergences of ritual separated them, no envious interests chilled their love, no denominational bars kept them apart. They marched under no different names. No ensign but the Cross was uplifted over their hosts. There was one "holy, universal and apostolic Church" throughout the whole world, of which the humblest and the greatest alike was a member. Time and again great captains by force of arms had sought to form one vast world empire, but had met with woeful failure. But here at last, under the invisible sovereignty of Jesus Christ, there arose a universal empire, engirdling land and sea, overlapping all nations and races, and uniting Christians everywhere in one spirit, tie and name.

It was a most beautiful and enchanting vision, and there can be no doubt that this spectacle of world unity was one of the most potent causes of the early Church's unprecedented progress. The world was impressed and awed by what it beheld. And the conviction resulted: "Verily, there is a moral miracle; this is what pagan history could never achieve; this is not of man, but of the power of God."

What an unhappy contrast to this beautiful ideal the

present divided and distracted state of Christendom exhibits! Some tell us that this condition is altogether natural; that it is but such a variety as is shown in the natural world. Very true it is that in nature we behold the law. Diversity in unity; that no two flowers, or trees, or lakes, or mountains, or landscapes are monotonously alike, but each has its distinctive miracle of design and beauty. That also every race, community and nation has its own peculiar character.

Yea! Every single human being has his individual type. But this diversity is one in secondary features, and does not contradict that dominant law of unity which everywhere underlies, overreaches and binds together all the parts in one. It is but variety in unity, hence it is a very diverse thing from Churches of one common master departing from one another's fellowship, and erecting separate organizations, creeds, altars and pulpits, which are a protest against and a censure of each other. Certainly this brings us under the condemnation of the apostle, who affirms that when one Christian says: "I am of Paul, and another I am of Apollos, and another I am of Peter, Christ is divided." Who does not know that these irreconcilable divisions into separate denominations do more than all else to weaken Christian influence and to afford an excuse to the worldly for remaining outside the Church altogether?

No wonder, then, that thoughtful Christians should lament this unnatural and unhappy state of affairs in Zion, separating Christians and even dividing families, and that they should consider it their solemn duty to give it close study and to labor and pray that it may be remedied.

To do this profitably let us ask first: *What is Christian unity?* What did Christ mean by the unity he enjoined upon his followers? And what is the unity so constantly urged in the Gospels and Epistles? There is no better answer in all the New Testament than the

famous passage we have chosen for our text. "There is one Spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all."

"There is *one Spirit.*" Christian unity is first, then, a unity of *spirit.* It is a oneness of heart, a likeness of soul, a harmony in spiritual temper. A thousand discordant influences form the natural man. What then can be expected except those envies, prejudices, hates and warrings which have so disfigured history? But all true Christians, born again by the Holy Spirit, are "new creatures in Christ Jesus." Hence they are cast in the same common mold. They are fashioned in the same image of Christ. They are begotten of the same Spirit. And having this harmony of mind and temper, there should be no divisions, no bickerings, no contentions between them; but bound together by the tie of love, they should live as one spiritual family, in one common concord, fellowship and communion.

One *faith,* further says our text. This is a most important addition. Unity of *"Spirit"* is general, but unity of *"faith"* is definite and specific. Christianity is not only a spirit, a sentiment, a temper of love, but it is also a faith. It sets forth clear-cut beliefs. It embraces a positive system of evangelical teaching. It preaches a Gospel of revealed truths. And a unity that has any just claim to be Christian must therefore be one *of* and *in* this faith, from which issue our spirit and temper. It is our convictions which mold our lives. Unless, then, we be grounded in the Christian faith as the root and spring of our characters, light as air will be our pretext of spiritual unity. Agreement in faith will alone lead to similarity of life, aim, conduct and hope. Therefore says the apostle: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all *speak* the *same thing,* and that there be no *divisions* among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the *same mind* and in the *same judgment.*"

In further pursuance of this injunction, the primitive Church drew up those short and comprehensive summaries of belief, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, that thus, with one mouth and voice, Christians might join in the confession and testimony of that one common faith which despite whatever minor diversities marked them, bound them together as with a bond of adamant the world over. Men who tell us they can be Christians in *spirit* while believing very little of Christian teaching and even rejecting cardinal Scriptural doctrines are dangerously self-deceived. Christian unity is a real thing, not an empty myth, and hence it must rest upon a solid, tangible basis. It can only exist where there is agreement in the faith, concurrent in the truth as it is in Jesus.

One baptism, one body, continues our text. That is true; Christian unity is outward as well as inward. It is visible as well as invisible. It is not only in the faith and spirit, but in "body," in "baptism," i. e., in outward form, in sacramental rites, in the external and visible signs of communion. In other words, Christian unity implies Church unity. The New Testament knows of but one Church. Its name everywhere is the same. It is called simply the "Church," or the "Church of Christ," or the "Church of God." No party names have as yet been fixed upon it. Its visible rites and sacraments are the same. Its government—under the two offices of minister and deacon—is everywhere the same. Its terms of admission are universally the same, baptism for children and confirmation for youth. A Christian in the Church at Jerusalem is also a Christian in fellowship and regular standing with the Church in Ephesus, or Corinth, or Carthage, or Sardis, or Rome.

There is but one ecclesiastical organization, but one great Christian empire, but one Holy City, but one temple, but one gate, throughout the whole world. And so that is but a very unsatisfactory unity which, with all its ardent profession of love, still dwells apart, refusing to

live together or to commune at the same altar, or to work and worship together, and which, with now and then a few complimentary salutes over the walls, goes back to build those walls higher and more insurmountable than ever.

When Christians have the real, Scriptural yearning for "Unity in the Spirit," and feel that they have but "One Lord, one Spirit, one faith, one baptism, one body, one God and Father of all," as our text urges, they will not be content with any mere makeshift and hollow courtesy, but they will want the real thing—*Church* unity. They will want to abandon their denominational, separatistic camps and blend together in the one holy Church Universal.

Secondly: What is it that prevents us from having this blessed unity of the New Testament time and of the golden era of primitive Christendom? What brought about the disruption of the one Church of Christ, and led to the present unhappy divisions? We answer that it was partly the love of truth and strong, conscientious conviction, and partly the infirmities and petty contentions of weak human nature. The first great breach occurred in the sixth century, when, over the comparatively trivial dispute as to the time of observing Easter, the Greek, which was the original and oldest Church, beginning at Jerusalem, broke off from the later Roman or Latin branch. The next great division the Roman Catholics charge upon Luther as the offender in the Reformation.

The Romanist, Dr. Walsh, praises the century preceding the Reformation as the greatest of centuries, and cites this eloquent description of it from the historian Frederic Harrison: "This great century, the last of the true Middle Ages, has a special character of its own that gives it an enchanting and abiding interest. There was one common creed, one ritual, one worship, one sacred language, one Church, a single code of manners, a

uniform scheme of society, a common system of education, an accepted type of beauty, a universal art, something like a recognized standard of the good, the beautiful, and the true. Men utterly different from each other, all profoundly accepted one common order of ideas, and could all feel that they were all together working out the same task." Is not this beautiful picture the very ideal of Christian unity and harmony that we are aiming at? And did Luther and his co-laborers destroy this splendid fabric? The reply is that this imposing structure of uniformity was at the sacrifice of real unity. And it merely retained the semblance of Christianity from which the soul of true piety had been banished. It was the harmony of tyranny, the uniformity of stagnation, the peace of death. And Luther sought not to destroy this majestic temple of unity, but only to cleanse it from the corruptions feeding upon its life, and which have made the Middle Ages to be called the Dark Ages, when civilization had reached the lowest ebb in history. Hence Luther's purpose was only to save, not to destroy, and the last thought in his mind was to break in twain this unity of the Church of God. So, when the die was about to be cast, he wrote an humble letter to the Pope saying that "he never could or would commit the awful sin of schism in Christ's Church. But he must be faithful to his conscience and continue to preach the pure Gospel for the guidance and saving of lost souls!"

Thereupon he was excommunicated, and millions following him, the second great breach occurred. How can then that schism be charged upon Luther? He denied the right of Rome to cast him out of the Church, and it was because he *protested* against this and other tyrannous papal acts, that he and his followers came to be called Protestants, from their famous protest at the Diet of Speyer in 1529.

Then Zwingli differed from Luther, and Calvin from

both, and Wesley from them all, and each set up a separate communion. And now in our day the spirit of sectarianism has run riot. Individualism largely supplants authority. Every innovator with a new ism imagines that he can start another Christian denomination. In the United States the evil of sect has attained its worst extravagance. It would seem here as if the name of the sects confronting us was legion.

And is not this deplorable state of Christendom a sin against the authority and headship of Jesus, a sin against the oneness of Christ's body, a sin against the unity of the Holy Universal Church, a sin displeasing to God on high, who is the Father of us all?

How can this sad breach be healed, and this distressing burden on the hearts of Christians be removed? Let us not dismiss it as impossible, as an idle dream. For that would be to deny that God rules. This unity cannot be brought about by *force*. That produces but hypocrisy, cramped uniformity and mental slavery. Rome tried that on a colossal scale and failed, only making the breach far worse.

How then can Christian unity be attained? This is a very practical question at the present time. All the separated Churches are discussing it. Every great Church body has appointed a commission to consider it. And some time, no doubt, these commissions will come together in a world-conference. If, then, Church unity is in the air, by what means can Christians help it onward?

There are three ways by which to do this. First, search the Scriptures. It is in our Bibles that we will learn our Christian duty as to Church unity. When Christ there teaches us of the one vine with many branches and of the one Shepherd with all the sheep in one fold; when Paul tells us that the Church is Christ's body, and that we all are members of that body; and when Peter shows the Church to be one holy temple built

up of many living stones, we get a vivid idea of the sin of these schisms and divisions, which contradict the whole Scriptural teaching of the unity of the Churches in their one Lord and Head.

Second, we should *believe* in, and work and pray for it. If we do not believe Church unity possible, of course it will never come. That it is so great a thing and looks so impossible, should not discourage us. And when the hearts of Christians everywhere are set on this great end, and when they unite in Christ's great sacerdotal prayer, "that they all may be one, as thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be *one in Us,*" then will this blessed consummation be at hand.

Finally, there will never be a reunion of our divided Christendom without *charity*. It will not come about by one denomination insisting absolutely on its doctrinal type and absorbing all the others. But each must meet the other on terms of full equality. In essentials nothing can be compromised; but on secondary differences, there must be mutual surrender. One motive must be supreme, the love of Christ, and the advancement and usefulness of his Holy Church. Putting from us, then, all indifference on the one hand, and all narrow bigotry on the other, let us work and pray that Christ's rent body be made one again, that the unhappy divisions in Zion be healed; that the charge of our text be realized.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

On April 2, 3, 1918, a conference was held in Norfolk, Va., between the commissions of the Christian Church, an American Communion of more than a hundred thousand members, and the Association for the Promotion of Christian Unity, representing the Disciples of Christ. The Christian representatives were Rev. J. F. Burnett, Rev. D. B. Atkinson, Rev. W. H. Denison, President W. A. Harper, Rev. W. W. Staley, Rev. C. H. Rowland, Rev. F. H. Peters, and Rev. John MacCalman; the Disciple representatives were Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Rev. E. B. Bagby, Rev. G. A. Miller, Rev. C. M. Watson, President R. A. Smith, Rev. Richard Bagby, Mr. W. P. Lipscomb and Rev. Peter Ainslie. Since 1912 two conferences have been held between these commissions, but this one was particularly significant in the fine spirit and definite understandings. Because of some unpleasantness through the years regarding Barton W. Stone, claimed by both Communions as a leader in their early histories, a committee was appointed to ascertain the facts. That committee consists of—for the Christians—Rev. J. F. Burnett, Rev. W. T. Morrill and Rev. W. W. Staley, and—for the Disciples—Rev. H. C. Armstrong, Rev. G. A. Miller and Rev. G. A. Campbell.

The committee on lines of coöperation recommended the following: 1. Closer coöperation in reform movements, exchange of pulpits, union services, exchange of ministers in evangelistic meetings and exchange of articles in our religious journals, eliminating controversy. 2. Exchange of delegates in conventions and conferences. 3. Appointment of a committee to devise closer relations between Church schools and benevolent institutions. This committee consists of—for the Christians—President W. A. Harper, Rev. Martyn Summerbell and Rev. F. H. Peters, and—for the Disciples—President R. A. Smith, Rev. C. M. Watson and Rev. Richard Bagby.

The agreements adopted were as follows: We recognize, 1. That Christ is the head over all things to the Church; 2. That the Bible is the only rule of faith and practise; 3. That the fundamental Protestant principle is individual freedom in the interpretation of the Scriptures; 4. That the local Church has its independence and autonomy; 5. That Christian Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the Scriptural ordinances of the Church; 6. That only Scriptural names should be used to designate the followers of Christ, the name Christian being preferable, regretting, however, that the present status requires the use of the terms "Christian" and "Disciple" to identify the members of these respective bodies; and 7. That we stand for and advocate the union of the followers of Christ.

At the public services addresses were delivered in the Church of the Disciples by Rev. C. M. Watson, Rev. John MacCalman, President W. A.

Harper and Rev. Peter Ainslie; at the Church of the Christians, by Rev. W. H. Denison, Rev. G. A. Miller, Rev. H. C. Armstrong and Rev. F. H. Peters. The conference cleared up much misunderstanding. Both sides showed a courtesy and fairness that indicated a decided progress to a more cordial fellowship.

Dr. Newman Smyth's recent appeal with eighty odd additional names, calling for joint ordination or consecration of the chaplains in the army and navy, which appeared in the last Quarterly, has called for comment in a number of religious journals. Others published the appeal without comment and a few of a partizan type ridiculed it. Among those expressing interest is the *Southern Churchman,* Richmond, Va., which makes the following response:

"It seems to us this challenge is directed with especial emphasis to our own Church. Will she be bold enough, believing enough, inconsistently consistent enough, to answer it; to cut through quite a lot of red tape, to muzzle in the emergency a few of her canons, to adopt a war measure in war times when the King's business requires haste? If the suggestion made in the appeal is the most practical one by which 'the Church might act as one,' will she adopt it? Or else, will she suggest some other way more practical, more emphatic, more radical, more self-sacrificial? Fortunately a special meeting of the House of Bishops has been called to assemble in New York in April. We believe that whatever action they might be led to take in this direction after prayerful consideration would meet with the approval of the Church and be ratified without question by the next General Convention."

The issue is pressed still further by *The Living Church,* Milwaukee, Wis., relative to comprehension rather than elimination, as follows:

"The 'way of comprehension' would involve the desire and the attempt to coördinate the positive principles that are maintained by different Communions in Christendom. The Papacy, episcopacy, presbyterial equality, and a congregational recognition of the priesthood of the laity must be coördinated as a step toward unity. The coming World Conference on Faith and Order may be presumed to be of service in presenting the basis for that step. But the step cannot really be taken until Papists, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists have the desire each to coördinate the principles of the others. In spite of all that has been written in the interest of unity by devout thinkers in each of these Communions we are not sure that any one of them to-day would really accept this principle of comprehension, realizing all that it implies. Would the signers of Dr. Smyth's appeal? Would our own fellow-Churchmen among those signers? That, then, is the problem of Christian unity; and that is what we mean when we say that it is more psychological than theological. But *The Living Church* pledges its support to just such a policy of comprehensiveness. Will any one else?"

Commenting on the continued fidelity of the ecclesiastical leaders to their Communions in the face of this appeal, *The Continent,* Chicago and New York, says:

"Yet after a month it is impossible to see where these burning words have kindled enough fresh sparks to speak of. The denominational war

commissions are all going along as tranquilly as ever, satisfied entirely, it seems, with the virtuous consciousness that they are not quarreling with one another. And ecclesiastical leaders do not seem to be exercised in any denomination over the state of affairs which this pronunciamento deplores."

In the last number of *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift,* Bern, Rev. J. Howard Swinstead, British chaplain at Stockholm, writing on "Relations Between the Anglican and Swedish Churches," has this to say, which contains an underlying principle that is applicable to all Communions:

"A careful selection of suitable points for mutual exchange might well gradually be made; gaps might be filled which have been needlessly left void; broad views may be taken without sacrifice of individual or national churchmanship; we may imitate varied methods in ecclesiastical administration; children's services may be framed and made more attractive by mutually borrowing ideas; preparation for Holy Communion may be systematized as in the Swedish Skriftermal (shriving); church art and music can be freely interchanged; our doors may be open daily to private worshippers; prejudices (against kneeling, laying on of hands, signing with the cross, and other marks of reverence) may be explained out of existence; dulness and monotony (and, that worst of all insidious obstacles—respectability in religion) can be banished by imitating other nations' best points, and all this by merely contributing our own one small talent to the treasury of the Church of God. Much can be done, quite unofficially, to pave a sure road and prepare common paths for mutual good-will and frank brotherhood. The seal of corporate action must be slow (and it should be), but it will finally be impressed on all brave experiments that have proved their worth and been found acceptable, harmless and edifying."

When we have really faced the difficulties attending reconciliation among Christians we will discover how far we have strayed from the path of Christ. Of this need, *Unity,* Chicago, says:

"The Christian Union Quarterly . . . is published in the interest of 'peace among the divided Churches of Christ.' It would be humorous if it were not so pathetically true that, judging from the literature put forth along these lines, it would seem that in the estimation of many ministers of religion the 'pacification of the denominations' is even more important than the 'pacification of nations,' as indeed it may be a more difficult task. The most as yet that the present peace workers among the sects seem to have accomplished is a cessation of hostilities; they have quit shooting into one another's camps, but the tremendous machinery involved in the 'denominational campaigns,' the money and men involved in 'headquarter activities' assumes that the militant *status quo* is to be preserved. The valiant denominational guards, if they sleep at all, still sleep on their arms. Not *federation* of the denominations, but *assimilation* through obliteration of militant lines alone will make of Christianity an efficient force in the pacification of the world. The editor of this Christian Union Quarterly catches a glimpse of that larger unity about which all the denominations prate and for which all preachers pray while armed to the teeth for war,—not with a united front against sin in high places, corruption in office, greed in business, dissipation in private life,—but one sect against another, one symbol against another, the Cross *versus* the Crescent and the six-pointed star of Judah rejected by both."

War conditions are enabling us to discover that there are possibilities of unity immediately at hand. Because of the coal shortage the Presbyterians and Disciples at Charlottesville, Va., the seat of the University of Virginia, united for eight weeks in Sunday services, while similar arrangements were effected in Rochester, N. Y., between the Brick Presbyterian and First Baptist Churches, of which Rev. W. A. Taylor writes:

"On the first Sunday in February, the regular time for the celebration of the Holy Communion in the Brick Church, the two congregations sat together at the Communion and the pastors all took part in the conduct of the services. On the first Sunday in March, the Churches having resumed services in their respective buildings, the Brick Church sent three of its elders to represent it at the Communion service in the Baptist Church. The congregations also united in the weekly devotional services. It was a very happy experience to all concerned."

Why should we wait for war and coal shortage for this expression of brotherhood among the followers of Christ? Have we got to be forced by trouble and hardship to do what Christ wants us to do through love for Him? These barriers must come down and Christ must prove Himself the Head of His Church.

Commenting on a union service between Catholics and Protestants "Somewhere in France," where several boys were christened by Protestants with the priest assisting and the general, himself a staunch Catholic, standing sponsor, *The Christian-Evangelist*, St. Louis, says:

"Many will think of it like *The Churchman*, of New York, which, speaking recently on courtesy and Christian unity, said: 'Erasmus once said that he had no vocation for martyrdom. The rector of an Episcopalian Church who ventures upon intercommunion celebrations of the Lord's Supper as a war measure must have a vocation for martyrdom,' and then after declaring that convinced churchmen have no intention of being made over into Presbyterians or Baptists and that Baptists will not be made over into Episcopalians, proceeds to say what we venture to endorse, that 'the first effective step toward unity will be an interdenominational courtesy based not upon mere sufferance and tolerance but upon humility—a humility that is eager to understand the rich spiritual gifts which Congregationalists, Presbyterians and Methodists can at their highest pitch of denominational conviction bring as their contribution to a reunited Church.' Such a method of union as that of the scene in France described by our correspondent has problems of various kinds, and they are much greater than merely psychological ones created by custom or theological thought. The incident shows that the undercurrents drawing or driving men together are far stronger than the surface or the ecclesiastical barriers that hitherto have kept them apart."

The training school for chaplains and approved chaplain candidates was officially opened at Fort Monroe, Va., March 1, 1918. The faculty consists of Major Alfred A. Pruden, Episcopalian; Major Ernest P. Newsom, Methodist Episcopal, South; Captain Robert R. Fleming, Baptist; Lieutenant Ignatius Fealy, Catholic; and Lieutenant Dr. O'Brien, whose denominational affiliation is not given. There are seventy-one enrolled students. Among these are nineteen Methodists, fifteen Baptists, twelve Roman Catholics, seven Presbyterians, four Episcopalians, four Lutherans, three

Disciples, two Congregationalists, two United Brethren, one Dutch Reformed, one Reformed, one Salvation Army. Rev. LeRoy Munyon, a student there, writing of this school, says:

"These men are from many of our best Churches and college forces—men of broad and varied experiences. The greater per cent of them have thorough theological training. In barracks, not in classes, views on doctrine, polity, etc., are exchanged freely and candidly. The finest fellowship obtains. General and sectional conferences, of course, are held to discuss our work with relation to the army. In these sectional conferences the Catholics form one group, all Protestants the other. The value of such intermingling of men of divergent opinions relative to the unity problem can be readily recognized. The period of this school will continue over five weeks from date of opening, at which time all will be assigned to their various regiments or stations, but it is generally agreed among us that our common task and training will have created in us a mutual interest, which could probably have been gotten in no other way."

It furnishes a good example for our theological schools. Men who are being trained to win the world for Christ are always at a disadvantage when trained in isolation. Perhaps this army experience may be of some value in unteaching our theological schools of the sectarian policy of having only those teachers who are members of their own Communion. On the great vitals of Christianity there is a substantial agreement, to say the least, among Protestants, but it would be an advantage to both Protestants and Catholics for each to have special courses of lectures from each side that they may get at first hand information regarding the problems of Roman Catholics and Protestants. One of the best lessons of this war will be the combining of denominational schools and denominational papers for the common task of winning a lost world to Christ.

Say what we please about disunion in the Church, its causes lie in the lack of religion. When the Holy Spirit gets the right of way in Christian lives—lives of believers in all the divisions of the Church—there will be healing power for the cure of every wound in the Body of our Lord. Disunion reveals the deplorable fact that the lack of religion is a universal condition. Whatever may be one's opinion about the Scriptures, they must be studied afresh for the way of freedom from one's own sins. There is power in the Gospel. We must find it or fail. Principal P. T. Forsyth recently read a paper at a conference at Mansfield College, Oxford, before members of the Evangelical school in the Episcopal Church and of the Free Churches, in which he said, as reported in a recent issue of *The Challenge*, London:

"There is enough power in that Gospel to remake the Church it made at the first, were it only cleansed of much perilous stuff, illuminated by much precious knowledge, and met by a faith as full as the grace behind it. The chief source of disunion is a lack in religion. It is not lack of sympathy but a lack in the positive religion. It is not lack of love so much as lack of the one divine kind of love—the love which has been forgiven by grace much and often. And nothing can create Christian religion but the world power of which such words are sacramental. I dwell on that word sacramental. The only formula of union must be sacramental. If it is but dogmatic it is divisive. It is there as a piece of the Church's worship. It is not to keep out heresy, but to confess faith and convey grace. Its atmosphere is as precious as its outline.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

A BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNION

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— "No single denomination now in existence is fitted to gather into itself the various divisions of Christendom and thus become that Church of the future for which we are longing. So says Ashworth, "The Union of Christian Forces," page 252.

Is there, then, a basis for the oneness of His people, for which our Master so earnestly prayed?

This writer thinks there is. He knows there is, or God's Son would never have prayed for it. And he is convinced that our Master knew the truth and expressed it when He said, "Every city or house divided against itself shall not stand." Russia's hopeless, helpless condition today is an illustration. A Church, teaching peace and practising war to-day, is an illustration.

We cannot doubt that it is our duty to seek earnestly for this union basis, now, *now*, because now, if ever, the Churches must stand together, or die apart.

What are the elements that must enter into such a basis?

Happily they are few and simple. In this respect they are like the plan of salvation, and even the wayfaring men can understand and rejoice in the hope union offers for the Kingdom's progress. I have never discussed the items of the basis I am about to suggest with any man who did not say that "I can accept all of that, though I may interpret its content different from your conception." And I have talked with representatives of almost every Protestant denomination in the country, and one or two Catholic laymen.

The elements that must enter into the union of Christ's people, as I have gathered them from these interviews, gather themselves about a few fundamentals—the ultimate authority in the Church, the proper designation of the members, the creed to be accepted, the conditions of fellowship or Church relationship, and the attitude toward the mooted questions of Christian doctrine and practise.

These five issues are vital. They must be approached in frankness and sincerity. No one is to be asked to give up anything. He can keep all he has, but he will not feel called upon to force his beliefs and practises on any one else. He will recognize all who name the name of Christ as his brethren and be happy that he can distinquish himself from his brother by the spiritual individuality that characterizes them in love. The basis we shall suggest shall not achieve a dead uniformity, because it shall not aim at it. No monotony will render it tedious, because all the notes of Heaven's orchestra will be struck in its anthem of praise and life. It will include all, and exclude none.

Here is the basis that has appealed to both laymen and ministers in all the Churches as a feasible, working basis of union in Christian effort. It has appealed also to sincere men out of the Church, but who are yet of the Kingdom, an all too great company, men who love the Christ, but who despise the petty divisions of those who essay to do His will, and yet refuse by living in divided cantonments to give His forces the resistless might of a conquering army. I shall

give it in outline, feeling sure it will commend itself to earnest seekers for the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. It is every one's prerogative to fill in the content for himself. He will be expected to do this after union is consummated, and should do it now.

Suggested basis of Christian union is as follows:

1. The ultimate authority in the Church—Jesus Christ.
2. The proper name for His followers—Christian.
3. The creed of His people—the Bible.
4. The proper test of fellowship—Christ-like character.
5. The attitude toward the things that divide whether of government or doctrine or sacramental practise—the liberty of conscience and the right of private judgment.

Very sincerely,
W. A. Harper.

President's office, Elon College, N. C.

SECTARIANISM IS SIN

To the Editor of THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY.

Dear Sir:— I have read your article in the last QUARTERLY on "The Power of the Divine Plan," with extraordinary interest and satisfaction. I have been an earnest student of the problem of the sects for more than forty years.

There is something fundamentally wrong in the conditions where one is under suspicion of his brethren, as though he were seeking some selfish end, if he speaks manfully for the brotherhood of all believers in harmony with the prayer of our Lord in John xvii and the simplicity of the faith that is in Jesus.

Discussions of denominational differences have continued for generations, without profitable results in the direction of harmony. The practical significance of that fact should be fairly faced. The importance of union is admitted by all; also limitations of the influence and power of the Church by sects, yet thousands of believers cherish intensive love for their own party, unwilling to surrender anything in consideration of the common and paramount interests of the Kingdom, blind to the cheering rays which are even now signs of a better day. It is time to consider with candor and prayerful insight what the situation means and demands. Whatever occasion there may have been, in experimental stages, for the various movements which are now represented by denominational names, *we have reached a stage in the evolution of the Church Kingdom when sectarianism is sin.*

Much has been learned by thoughtful students since the days of Alexander Campbell. Much may be learned before the end of the world's woe. The Great War is surely changing all things—all things that have not been vital, fundamental and permanent from the beginning, and *demonstrated to be such by experience.*

The world-woe may be the birth-pangs of the nations into a new national and international order. The "war of frightfulness" may have an important relation to the Kingdom of God. He may be permitting the chastisement of the nations for their sins, and a clearing of the world for a better proclamation by his Church of His messages of love to mankind. The thoughts of many have changed as the struggle has gone on. Three years ago Lloyd George said proudly: "Germany must be crushed." Now he says: "We must go on, or go under." Count Okuma of Japan sees in the Great War the destruction of European civilization. The indications are that the world is being carried forward irresistibly to an entire social reconstruction. The woe may continue until Christians see that in order to save any-

thing worthy to be called civilization, there must be not only a brotherhood of men in a "safe democracy," but a brotherhood of believers in all the world.

What now has the Church of Jesus Christ specially to learn? Must it not save itself to save the world?

The toiling masses of the world have introduced certain words into the situation to which Christians may well give heed and careful consideration. The words "union,"—"comrades"—"brothers"—which mean so much to labor, may without doubt be conquering words for the future. So sagacious an observer as Mr. Charles Schwab has said: "The future is in the hands of labor." This indicates that light from the dawn of a new day has penetrated the world of business. Labor, by its unions and federation of unions, uniting different ways of service for ends that are common to all, may point a way for the separated parts of the Church of God.

The various Church hymnals are a demonstration of the spiritual unity of believers as a present fact. All are drawn from the same sources. They are records of the common experiences of grace and faith. A standard hymnal for the use of all Churches might be made of hymns that are common to all. Believers cannot worship God in a sectarian way. The Holy Spirit has not failed in His promised service. The "fruits of the Spirit" manifested in human lives demonstrate the fact that God is raising up saints for "glory everlasting" in all the "evangelical" denominations. The proclamation of the common faith in God, in His Son and His way of grace and salvation—that is what God blesses everywhere. (See Acts xvi. 31; 1 Cor. 12:13; Jude, the 3rd verse.)

Spiritual unity in the true discipleship began before all other names that are now known, and has ever been present in the world. What has been lacking, and is now lacking, is a suitable manifestation of the spiritual fact—"*singing to one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, making melody in their hearts unto God.*"

It may not be necessary for names that have entered into historic developments to wholly disappear; indeed, it may be possible for them to be an occasion for the manifestation of a better, because a more unselfish love than could be manifested without them. Thus the imperfections of men, as so often in our world, may be turned to promote the perfections of God.

"Unity cannot come on secondary issue. It must be on the primary." The article on "The Power of the Divine Plan" touches a high spiritual note, and strikes to the depths of things that are vital. I can only refer now to one matter touched upon in the article—that of the "ordinances." Baptism and the Lord's Supper are *signs* of things vital, not the very things. The article states truly that with the sacramentalist interpretation of the Lord's Supper "has gone deepening experiences of centuries," while in the observance as a memorial "has been equally deepening experiences of fellowship with the great heart of God." These statements are demonstrably true, and prove that questions as to the "ordinances" are secondary, not primary, in discussions of Christian union. One word, brotherhood—the brotherhood of believers—must be the prevailing word for the Church which Jesus loved and for which He gave up Himself, if the Church is to save itself and save the world. Sectarian divisions must not permanently prevent the practical manifestation of Christian Fellowship from extending as far as the realized fellowship of the Holy Spirit in the lives of believers.

Yours for Christian union,

Almon Taylor Clarke.

Congregational Church, West Palm Beach, Fla.

CB

CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY
1917-1918

DATE	ISSUED TO